

**A CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE ROLE AND PLACE OF  
PARIPURNA RAJAYOGA IN RELATION TO  
EMERGENT INDIAN PHILOSOPHICAL SYSTEMS**

**RAPELLI SREEDHAR**

M.A. (PHILOSOPHY), M.Sc. (PHYSICS)



Under the Guidance of  
**Prof R. VENKAT REDDY**  
M.A.(Psychology), M.A.(Philosophy), Ph.D.  
Head, Department of Philosophy  
Osmania University  
Hyderabad 500 007 A.P., INDIA

Thesis Submitted to  
**OSMANIA UNIVERSITY**  
For the Award of the Degree of  
**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**  
**IN PHILOSOPHY**  
2000

TO  
MY DEAREST SPIRITUAL MASTER

SRI VIVEKANANDA  
AGĒLU SANGAYĀKHYA  
RAJAYOGI

## **DECLARATION**

I hereby declare that the thesis entitled "A critical review of the role and place of Paripurna Rajayoga in relation to emergent Indian Philosophical Systems" is an original research work undertaken by me and submitted to Osmania University, Hyderabad for the award of the degree of Ph.D. in Philosophy. This thesis or any part of it has not been submitted for any degree of this or any other University.

Date: 5 MAY 2000

  
(R. SREEDHAR)

**Prof. R. VENKAT REDDY**  
Head of the Department



Department of Philosophy  
Osmania University  
Hyderabad - 500 007  
A.P., INDIA.

## **CERTIFICATE**

This is to certify that the thesis entitled "**A critical review of the role and place of Paripurna Rajayoga in relation to emergent Indian Philosophical Systems**", submitted by **R. Sreedhar** for the award of the degree of **DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY** in philosophy is an original work carried out by him under my guidance . The thesis or any part there of has not been submitted for any degree to any other University.

Date : 6 / 5 / 2000

  
(R. VENKAT REDDY)

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research work has been carried out under the able guidance of **Prof R. Venkat Reddy, Head, Department of Philosophy, Osmania University, Hyderabad**. I am very grateful to my research supervisor for his constant encouragement, guidance and kind co-operation at every stage of this work.

I express my gratitude to **Prof P. Sandeep, Principal, College of Education, Osmania University, Hyderabad** for his kind co-operation and valuable suggestions.

I am very grateful to my spiritual master, **Sri Vivekananda Agolu Sangayakhya Rajayogi** for his valuable suggestions and guidance.

I convey my sincere regards to my parents, **Smt Shakunthala** and **Sri Rapelli Ramachandram** for their kind co-operation and moral support during my thesis work. I express my lovely regards to my wife, **Suneetha** for her constant encouragement and moral support to complete this thesis work at the earliest. I express my heartfelt regards to my brother, **Sreekanth** for his help in collecting the source materials of my thesis.

I am thankful to Dr S. S. Murthy, Dr A. Venkata Chary, Dr M. Surender, P. Srimannarayana, G. Srinivas, K. Ramesh, P. Manohar, A. Nataraj, M. Seeta Ramulu, and the other friends who helped me in carrying out this research work.

**R. SREEDHAR**

## CONTENTS

Chapters	Page no.
Chapter-I : <b>INTRODUCTION</b>	1 - 21
Chapter-II : <b>THE MANIFESTATIONS OF VARIOUS SYSTEMS OF YOGA</b>	22 - 66
Chapter-III : <b>A CRITICAL REVIEW OF MAIN SYSTEMS OF YOGA IN RELATION TO VEDANTA</b>	67 -111
Chapter-IV : <b>THE ROLE AND PLACE OF PARIPURNA RAJAYOGA IN RELATION TO EMERGENT INDIAN PHILOSOPHICAL SYSTEMS</b>	112 -136
Chapter-V : <b>CONCLUSION</b>	137 -142
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	143-146

# **CHAPTER - I**

## **INTRODUCTION**

## CHAPTER - I

# INTRODUCTION

Perhaps it is right to say that the main aim of all religious and philosophical systems is to get liberation from *samsāra*. To get liberation from *samsāra*, man has created various religions, philosophies, and theories. Great ṛṣis, philosophers, and scientists have seriously searched for the origin and cause of the Universe since the time immemorial. In that quest so many theories have been developed to solve the secret of the Universe. In the inquisition of absolute reality or God, the Vedas and Upanisads were premier outcomes of the efforts of ṛṣis in the ancient period. The other philosophical scriptures such as the Brahma-Sūtrās, Bhagavad Gita, Itihāsās, Purāṇas and the other *sāstrās* were emerged in a long period of time in ancient India. All these are the fruits of research efforts of great thinkers undoubtedly.

Either due to the contradicting *śrutis* in the Vedas and Upaniṣads, or due to the different ways of ṛṣis, or due to the place, time, and milieu of thinkers; various philosophical and religious systems were established in different periods of a very long time.

If one looks into Indian cultural heritage, one can see various philosophical scriptures such as the Vedas, Upaniṣads, Brahma-Sūtrās, Bhagavad Gita, Itihāsās, Purāṇas and other *sāstrās* etc., and various philosophical systems such as Ārvāka, Jainism,



Buddhism, Śāḍ-darsanas, Śaiva, Śākṭeya, Soura, Gāṇapathya, Kūṭicaka, Kāpālīka etc. In one word the Indian Philosophy is a huge ocean which was enriched by uncountable philosophical systems. Of these systems Advaita, Viśiṣṭadvaita, and Dvaita have become popularised among the people.

Among all systems of philosophies, one can find various systems of Yoga. Various religious people viewed and practised the different systems of Yoga in different ways. However it is clear that various systems of Yoga have great importance in their respective religions.

From very ancient time the general mass of the people in all countries has associated religion with mysteries, miracles, and supernatural phenomena. In early days people believed that evil spirits were the cause of all diseases, and priests were often summoned to exorcise the devil. Even today there are persons who will seek the help of Priests, Sannyāsins, and Yogis for the cure of physical ailments. This practice is common not only among the ignorant, but also extends to the educated classes. Even rationalists and those who are proud of their practical wisdom sometimes fall back on supernatural remedies, as a last resort, when all other efforts have failed. There is also a tendency, especially among the rich, to seek the advice of those professing religion on short cuts to worldly success. Many of them visit sādhus simply for the purpose of knowing, if possible, what further material rewards the future holds for them; to them Religion and Astrology mean the same thing! In the west a large number of persons who are ignorant of the real conditions in India think of Hinduism in the terms of Astrology or

Palmistry; for them every Indian they meet in a train or on board an aeroplane is a potential fortune-teller.

In almost every country the charlatans ply a flourishing trade in the name of Religion. Deception has gone to the farthest limit in the case of Yoga also that much abused aspect of Hindu Mysticism. People have all sorts of queer ideas about Yoga. Someone described Yoga as mainly the method of acquiring miraculous powers over the body. The usual drinking of sulphuric acid, munching of glass and swallowing of fire among the other miracles is Yoga in his view. He does not know that all those are mere bag of tricks.

It is said that some persons go to the Himalayas in search of Yogis and Mahātmās and come back terribly disappointed if they could not meet even one who performed miracles. A few of these miracle-hunters, after repeated failures, turn bitter, and try to make dupes of others by writing sensational books on Yoga.

At times amusing and at times very sad of what strange ideas people sometimes have regarding Yogis and imaginary Mahātmās supposed to be living in Himalayas. It is said that not long ago an American wrote to a Yogi who resides in Himalayas to practice Yoga. He was apparently disappointed when he received the reply that he could as well practice Yoga at home provided he developed faith in and devotion to God. This is a typical instance of an unfortunate attitude of mind which shows how uncommon is "Common Sense" in religious matters. It may happen that sometimes a person in search of a miracle-worker deserves sympathy on account of some sudden

calamity that has weakened his reasoning power; but there are others who seem deliberately to relinquish all claims to reason as soon as they speak of religion.

Those who lived in the Himalayas for a long time, and are honest, will admit that the mere proximity of those lofty mountains is not sufficient to the attainment of Yoga. No doubt the environment of the Himalayas offers many great advantages, but that alone is no guarantee for one's spiritual success in life. Even in the remotest corners of the Himalayas there are persons who live the same kind of life as those in the plains. The solitude and sublimity of the high snows has no spiritual value for them. By seeking the recesses of the Himalayas one may get temporary peace or respite from the troubles of life, but the vagaries of the mind soon return and continue their old game. It is only by ceaseless struggle that one gets strength, and it is by dint of hard labour alone that success in spiritual life is achieved by the strong. Only a very few, however, are prepared to pay the heavy price demanded for such achievement; the rest are content to run after cheap and tawdry remedies or to waste their time in the search of occult methods and secret places.

What, then, is Yoga? What is the importance of Yoga? And of what use it is for an individual to lead his life? What does it connote and what does it aim at? And how did different forms of Yoga emerge either sequentially or simultaneously to fulfil the purpose of life? All these questions arise when one looks into Yoga. The word, Yoga, is derived from the Sanskrit root, *yuj*, one meaning of which is to join, to unite, to yoke. However the meaning of Yoga changes from context to context.

## YOGA:

Yoga has a general and a specific sense. First, it refers to a certain range of methods of contemplation used in the Indian religious tradition, both Hindu and non-Hindu; second, it refers to a recognized school of Hindu metaphysics, allied to particular contemplative techniques within the certain range mentioned above. Literally, Yoga means "harnessing" or "Yoking" - the harnessing or controlling of one's faculties. It is fairly clear from archaeological evidence from the Indus valley that yogic techniques date from prehistoric times in India. Judging from later evidence, these techniques were associated with a sharp distinction between the eternal element in man, the individual *puruśa* or Soul, and the psychophysical organism. Buddhism, even if it made use of Yoga, put the distinction in a different place; namely, between Nirvana as a permanent state and the impermanent states that make up the individual person. The object of Yoga is to isolate this eternal element and to free it from implication in the material world. Thus, Yogic techniques aim at attaining a conscious state in which ordinary mental activities, such as perception and imagination, are suspended.

The techniques used may roughly be divided into physical and mental ones. Both in orthodox and in Buddhist yoga, posture (*āsana*) is important, notably the "lotus posture", which is a variant of the normal Indian mode of sitting. The postures are elaborated into what is virtually a whole system of gymnastics in Yoga. Likewise, yoga emphasizes control of the breath, a kind of respiratory gymnastics, physical virtuosity is not regarded as an end in itself,

however, and in some traditions - for example, Buddhism - is considerably played down. Physical yoga (Known as Hatha - Yoga in the Yoga system) is a preliminary to mental discipline.

The latter can be illustrated from Buddhist sources. In Buddhism the principal form of discipline (in Pali, *Jhana*; in Sanskrit, *dhyana*, or "meditation") is divided into eight or nine stages. In the first four of these, a "device" (*Kasina*) is used. The yogi may use a blue flower, a round piece of clay, or other object, on which he concentrates his attention. He contemplates it in abstraction from its surroundings, in such a way that he is no longer aware of the distinction between subject and object, with the aim of isolating it as mere sense datum. After these stages he goes on to contemplate without the use of such an external aid, but tries to think of reality as consisting solely of empty space, then as pure consciousness, then as nonexistent (he repeats to himself the formula "There is nothing"). Finally, he hopes to reach a region of "neither-perception - nor - nonperception," in which the awareness of being aware of anything is removed. Such mind-emptying techniques are often interpreted as helping to give the contemplator an insight into truth, and it is through the mystical experiences accruing from such techniques that the doctrinal systems believed in by the mystics of various schools are often thought to be verified. Thus, what is "discovered" through Yoga is interpreted in number of ways.

The metaphysical system known as Yoga is meant to underpin and explain the methods of liberation adopted by the yogi. It is one of the six orthodox schools (*Ṣad-darśanās*) of Hindu philosophy. The

classical exposition is that of Patanjali (second century B.C.) in the *Yogasutras*, a codification of earlier ideas. Also noteworthy are the *Yogabhasya* attributed to Vyasa and the *Yogavartika* of Vijnanabhiksu (sixteenth century). But Yoga, as a system, is hardly distinguishable from Samkhya and is an adaptation of the latter in the light of practical considerations. The chief distinction between the two systems is that Yoga introduces the concept of a God (*Isvara*). However, he has no creative functions but is one among the innumerable souls who happens, unlike all others, never to have been implicated in matter and who can be used beneficially as an object of meditation. Thus, he helps souls to liberation: but this liberation does not involve oneness with God. It consists in isolation (*Kaivalya*), a state in which the soul exists eternally without any kind of conscious relation either to matter or to other souls and in which it is exempted from pain.

The other chief difference between Samkhya and Yoga is that the latter stresses contemplative techniques, the former metaphysical knowledge, as the means of liberation. But even this is not a great distinction, since knowledge here, as nearly everywhere in the Indian tradition in this sort of context, means something more existential and intuitive than merely intellectual or theoretical.

The training prescribed in Yoga is divided into eight "stages" (like the Buddhist Middle path): restraint, discipline, posture, respiration, withdrawal from sense objects, concentration, meditation, and trance. Restraint means moral training; discipline is ascetic and religious - the practice of austerity, meditation on God; posture and respiration comprise the exercises of Hatha-Yoga; withdrawal from

sense objects involves the ability to free oneself from the impact of external stimuli, although an imaginative awareness of phenomena remains; concentration is, in classical Yoga, analogous to the first four stages of Buddhist *jhāna*, say<sup>iv</sup>e that the examples used are rather different fire, Visnu, the heart, and so on are employed as the imaginative objects of meditation, and the aim is a kind of penetration into the "real essence" of these entities; meditation is analogous to the second four stages of *jhāna* and in the last stage one is supposed finally to achieve, through the foregoing techniques, a kind of transcendental knowledge in deep trance. However, the last three stages are hard to differentiate clearly and are sometimes grouped under the same head. The transcendental knowledge attained involves a vivid awareness of the nature of the soul and its essential distinctness from the psychophysical organism.

## **VARIOUS FORMS OF YOGA:**

There are three main yoga systems in relation to the Vedānta and Bhagavad Gita. They are Karma - Yoga, Bhakti - Yoga, and Jnana - Yoga. Advaita prefers Jnana -Yoga whereas Viśiṣṭadvaita and Dvaita prefer Bhakti - Yoga. Hence it is obvious that different religious systems prefer one of these yoga systems and reject the other yoga systems. Sometimes religious systems state that any one of yoga systems leads to *mokṣa* independently. Someone says that these three main yoga systems are not separate, but rather complementary to one another. Hence a few questions can be raised. How did evolve all these yoga systems? Of them does any system lead to liberation without another? Are all these systems of yoga

different from one another or complementary to one another? If so, how? How the comprehensive meaning can be given for it? All these things will be discussed in this thesis.

In relation to the Vedas, Upanisads, and Bhagavad Gita, there is a systematic method of practice for the achievement of the highest goal i.e. liberation. That systematic method of practice is called Yoga.

As discussed earlier, there are three main yoga systems: 1) Karma - Yoga, 2) Bhakti - Yoga, and 3) Jnana - Yoga. These are described briefly in relation to Paripurna Rajayoga.

## 1) KARMA - YOGA:

According to the *śruti*, '*buddhih karmānusārini*', the *viṣayās* which are determined in *buddhi* are practised by the *Karmēndriyās* in the form of actions such as *sātvika*, *rājasa*, and *tāmasa karmās*<sup>1</sup>. This process is known as Karma - Yoga. But without knowing the Brahman and its characteristics or the causation of soul and world, one cannot get liberation through Karma-Yoga. This yoga was viewed in different ways with respect to different religions according to their theories. Advaita, Viśiṣṭadvaita, and Dvaita did not give much priority to Karma - Yoga. Somebody thinks that Karma - Yoga is recommended for only active person. In this thesis it will be known that Karma - Yoga is incomplete without the other yoga systems such as Jnana - Yoga and Bhakti - Yoga.



## 2) BHAKTI - YOGA:

According to the theory of Paripurna Rajayoga, the union of the Jnana and the Karma harmoniously together is called Bhakti - Yoga. First of all the *sādhaka* has to get the real knowledge of the Brahman (this is Jnana - Yoga) and then all the actions performed by him must be preceded by that knowledge (this is Karma - Yoga). And besides there must be a harmony between Jnana and Karma. That means there must be a harmony between *manas*, mind which is a source of knowledge and *śarīra*, body which is an instrument to perform all actions. If harmony exists fearlessly, it is called Bhakti-Yoga<sup>2</sup>. This yoga was also viewed differently by various religious systems of India. However this yoga is also incomplete without the Paripurna Rajayoga.

## 3) JNANA - YOGA:

According to the theory of Paripurna Rajayoga the knowledge of discrimination between real (Paripurna Brahman) and unreal (Brahman) is called Jnana. If any one knows that Brahman is the cause of Karma (this is Jnana), he should not look after the fruits of actions ( this is karma). Either fruits may be positive or may be negative, one should not bother about them<sup>3</sup>. This is called Jnana - Yoga. Hence Jnana - Yoga is incomplete without Karma - Yoga. This yoga was also practised in different ways by various religious systems of India.

To make this chapter more complete a few other types of yoga systems must be mentioned. Either they may be separate schools of Yoga or elaborations of some aspects or stages as they occur in the course of integral yoga practice. Of these yoga systems Paripurna Rajayoga is separate and independent school of Yoga. And at the end of the thesis, it is observed that it is the most significant yoga system among all the other yoga systems and it gives absolute yogic view.

### **YOGA OF PATANJALI:**

According to Patanjali (150 B.C.), Yoga is a methodical effort to attain perfection through the control of the different elements of human nature, physical and psychical<sup>4</sup> with the help of Astanga - Yoga. '*Yogah citta vṛtti nirōdhah*'. It is some what similar to Raja - Yoga .

The yoga system handed down under the name of Patanjali and presented in the slender volume of his Yoga-Sutras has gained the reputation of being the classical exposition of yoga. It is sometimes referred to as Raja-Yoga. The methodical scheme of Patanjali's Yoga has like that of the Buddha eight parts. All of them had been known before Patanjali and their gradual emergence and even the process of ordering them into a sequence almost identical with that of Yoga-Sutras can be followed in the Yoga Upanisads. However it is clear that he arranged the Yoga-Sutras which were existing before his time in a systematic order.

## MANTRA - YOGA:

*Adhiṣṭāna* Brahman has created this Universe which has names and forms. That *Adhiṣṭāna* Brahman's names and forms have to be meditated by words (*mantrās*)<sup>5</sup>. This process of meditating the *Adhiṣṭāna* Brahman by the *mantras* is known as Mantra - Yoga.

In this process the meditation of *mantrās* dissolves the name and form in the name and form respectively. This yoga consists sixteen *angās* (parts). They are *Bhakti*, *Śuddhi*, *Āsana*, *Pančāṅga Seva*, *Ācara*, *Dhāraṇa*, *Divyadeśa Nirṇaya*, *Prāna Kriya*, *Mudra*, *Tarpaṇa*, *Yajna*, *Bali*, *Yāga*, *Japa*, *Dhyāna*, and *Samādhi*.

By the Mantra - Yoga, all the names and forms are dissolved in Brahman. Hence the *laya kriya* of *stula* - *śarīra* (physical body) is called Mantra - Yoga.

## HATHA - YOGA:

Hatha - Yoga may be viewed as a further extension of the third and fourth parts of Patanjali's Yoga system, namely that concerned with the bodily posture (*asana*) and that dealing with the control of breathing (*prāṇāyāma*). Nothing is known about any elaborate system of bodily positions in Patanjali's time apart from several variations of the cross-legged sitting posture, and little is known about the techniques of the breathing exercises, although they undoubtedly existed in Patanjali's time and even earlier. But the beginning of the whole system of Hatha - Yoga is still obscure. Nowadays it comprises

three main disciplines; a sequence of intricate bodily positions, a number of procedures for the purification of the body internally, and numerous complicated breathing exercises.

All sources seem to agree that Hatha - Yoga is a useful if not entirely necessary introduction to higher Yoga of some kind and that it cannot lead to the realization of higher truth on its own. But it is maintained that it greatly increases the chance of subsequent spiritual progress when a mental Yoga path is taken up. The system of bodily positions is supposed to have been designed in order to bring about perfect physiological harmony in the organism, which amounts to perfect health and efficiency. In the process of bodily training the mind is trained as well, for the Yogi develops through it a high degree of self-control and determination and learns the technique of self-observation, which leads to the heightening of the capacity of awareness. This is very nearer to Yoga of Patanjali i.e. '*Yōgah citta vṛtti nirōdhah*'. By this subtle body can be controlled. In this system great emphasis is laid also on the influence of the exercises on the nervous system whose sensitivity is further enhanced by the purificatory procedures.

The protracted practice of complicated breathing exercises is meant to influence the working of the mind towards increasing its ability to concentrate and some of them are designed to produce ecstatic states of mind or trances. It is further believed that the breathing exercises activate the subtle vital energy of the body which is in fact the cosmic life-force (*prāṇa*) which sustains man and through which he is linked to the universal or cosmic dimension of life.

On the whole it can be stated that the process by which *sūkṣma-śarīra* (subtle body) is dissolved in *citta*<sup>6</sup> by the help of Astanga - Yoga is called Hatha - Yoga.

### **LAYA - YOGA:**

Due to the combination (*samyōga*) of *Prakṛti* and *Puruṣa*, the creation is on. All the universal substances are existing in *Prakṛti* and *Puruṣa*. Until the *Kundalini - Śakti* is in the state of *śuṣupti* in *Ādhāra - Ākāśa*, it is responsible for sexual and procreational energy and it leads to external creation. But if *Kundalini - Śakti* is awakened and dissolved in *Puruṣa*, which is in the *Sahasrāra - Padma* or *Sahasrāra - Ākāśa*, for them there is no creation. In that state *sādhaka* realizes the universal form of Brahman. This system is called Laya - Yoga. It has nine *angās* (parts). They are *Yama*, *Niyama*, *Stūlakriya*, *Sūkṣmakriya*, *Prathyāhāra*, *Dhāraṇa*, *Dhyāna*, *Layakriya*, and *Samādhi*.

On the whole it can be stated that by Laya - Yoga, *Prakṛti* which is in the form of *ajñāna* at *Ādhāra - Ākāśa* is dissolved in *Puruṣa* (Brahman)<sup>7</sup>, which is at *Sahasrāra - Padma*. Hence the *laya kriya* of *kāraṇa-śarīra* is known as Laya - Yoga.

### **KUNDALINI - YOGA:**

An occult superstructure to which Hatha - Yoga may lead those who feel inclined to go that way is called Kundalini-Yoga. Its basis is an elaborate and complicated teaching that describes in great detail

the physiology of man's subtle body which is supposed to be the vehicle of the cosmic life-force (*prāṇa*). The teaching on one or more subtle and mental bodies or "sheaths" of man (*śarīras* or *kōśas*) apart from the physical one is very old and mentioned clearly in some Upanisads.

The theory goes that certain Hatha - Yoga positions practised in a particular way and combined with further exercises called *mudras* awaken the dormant spiritual energy called *kundalini* which normally rests coiled in the shape of a serpent in the subtle body at the base of the spine. When awakened by appropriate yoga practices, this "serpent" power uncoils and starts rising along the spine through the channel of the subtle body called *suṣumna*. On its way it passes through six spiritual centres (*cākrās*) and activates them, which results in the acquisition of special psychic power on the part of the Yogi. The climax is reached when *Kundalini* arrives at the top of the skull, which is the highest point of its journey but is no longer quite a part of the Yogi's subtle body. This is nothing but Laya - Yoga. It represents a gate to Enlightenment and is referred to as the "thousand - petalled lotus" (*sahasrāra - padma*). In that state one can see the Universal form of *Adhiṣṭāna* Brahman. It seems that some Yoga schools believed that Enlightenment could be reached merely through the practice of Kundalini - Yoga, by compelling the passage of the *Kundalini - Śakti* which represents also the creative spiritual force of the Universe through the spiritual centers of the subtle body to the thousand - petalled lotus. However, the prevailing opinion seems to be that accompanying exercises of a spiritual kind are necessary. Spiritual Yoga, which nearly always follows Patanjali's scheme to

some extent or other, is therefore, being superior, called Raja - Yoga or the "royal path".

"As indicated the spiritual energy (*śakti*) of *Kundalini* is supposed to be essentially the same creative energy that, on the cosmic level, brings about the manifestation of the universe. In unawakened men this energy is responsible for their sexual and procreational potency. This being so, a view was developed that man's sexual energy could be directly utilised for the purpose of his spiritual progress"<sup>8</sup>.

This is the province of Tantric Yoga, a mysterious and as yet very little explored territory of Indian religious and Yogic tradition, despite the considerable amount of literature dealing with the subject. But it seems clear enough that Tantrism in general and Tantric Yoga in particular are split into two main schools of thought with corresponding Yoga practices. If the sexual energy is utilised directly for spiritual practice by being transformed into pure spiritual energy, one speaks about right-hand Tantric practice. If sexual practices on the physical level are a part of the methodical procedure with the alleged aim of thereby inducing a direct experience of and link to the cosmic creative forces, it is left - hand Tantric practice.

However the roots of the Kundalini - Yoga can be found in the Upaniṣads and it is aimed at only to get dormant spiritual energy, but not at Paripurna Brahman. Hence it can be concluded that by practising Kundalini - Yoga, *Sādhaka* gets only the view of universal form of Brahman.

## RAJA - YOGA :

*Antahkaraṇa* is the cause of *śṛṣṭi*, *stīti*, and *laya* (evolution, sustenance, and dissolution). Its transformations are *manas*, *buddhi*, *citta*, and *ahankāra*. *Adhiṣṭāna* (basis) of this *antahkaraṇa* is the self luminous Brahman. By dissolving his *antahkaraṇa* *catustaya*, one has to unify his Jnana with *Adhiṣṭāna* Brahman. Thereby the *pratibimbās* (images) due to *māya* reflected in *antahkaraṇa* are dissolved in Brahman<sup>9</sup>. Hence the dissolving of *antahkaraṇa* is known as Raja - Yoga. But Paripurna Rajayoga is different from this Raja-Yoga.

So far various forms of yoga are reviewed and it is not possible to analyze the other forms of yoga of Indian Philosophy in this context. All these forms of yoga are related with only Brahman, but these forms do not indicate Paripurna Brahman which is beyond of Brahman. According Paripurna Rajayoga, Brahman is the cause of the world. Hence all these forms of yoga are not helpful to come out of the round of rebirth. Hence it can be stated that Paripurna Rajayoga is evolved as a complete view of yoga to come out from the illusion of the cycle of birth and death. And at the end of the thesis, it is known that all the forms of yoga are evolved to reach the different states of Brahman and all these forms of yoga except Paripurna Rajayoga do not indicate Paripurna Brahman which is beyond of Brahman.



## PARIPURNA RAJAYOGA:

In contrast with the other yoga systems, Paripurna Rajayoga has a great significance because it is comprehensive, complete, and compact. Various yoga systems were followed by various religious systems in order to attain *mōkṣa* whereas Paripurna Rajayoga transcends all of them and leads to a complete experience of truth. This is because it has overcome all the limitations and fallacious assumptions of all other forms of Yoga.

Theory of Paripurna Rajayoga imbibes all types of yoga systems<sup>10</sup>. It does not give preference to any particular Yoga by rejecting remaining Yogas. All kinds of yoga systems are given equal priority in relation to Paripurna Rajayoga. It shall be observed that these are not separate, but rather complementary to one another and these together constitute a complete yogic approach. Thus the emergence of Paripurna Rajayoga can be explained as an evolutionary development of the complete view of Yoga which fills all gaps, replenishes all deficiencies, synthesizes all the apparent contradictions, rectifies all the erroneous assumptions, and inter connects all the missings of the various philosophies of Yoga.

Paripurna Rajayoga will not give any mysterious or miraculous powers but it gives a clear, comprehensive, and independent path to lead one's life towards liberation from the illusion of the cycle of birth and death.

This Yoga is not a new one. It is as old as the Vedas and Upanisads. It has been handed over from one generation to the other through *Guru - Sāmpradāya* since ancient times. The central teachings of Paripurna Rajayoga are mainly drawn from the Upaniṣads such as Bṛhadāraṇyakōpaniṣad, Amṛtabindūpaniṣad, Tejōbindūpaniṣad, Anantōpaniṣad, Sarvasārapūrnōpaniṣad, Cāndōgyōpaniṣad, etc. And this Yoga is also supported by the Vedas, Brahma - Sūtras, Bhagavad Gita, and Uttaragita. All these scriptures form the core of the Vedantic thought and these works belonged to ancient period. During the 15th century A.D. the most important tenets of this Yoga have been taught by Vemana through his thousands of verses in Telugu language<sup>11</sup>. Later, in the 18th century (1750s), this Paripurna Rajayoga was re-established and revived as an independent doctrine by Siva Rama Dikṣitulu through his magnum opus 'Bṛhadvāśiṣṭamu', who lived in Andhra Pradesh, India<sup>12</sup>. And in the 20th century, Dayananda Ponnala Rajayogi disseminated this Yoga in Andhra Pradesh through his excellent 'Rajayogeeyamu'.

The works of many eminent exponents of this Yoga were in Telugu language and no English translations are available and hence it is not very much publicised and popularised among people.

As little or no academic work has been undertaken on this Paripurna Rajayoga, it is felt that research studies have to be initiated to examine the role and place of Paripurna Rajayoga in relation to emergent Indian Philosophical Systems. And hence this research work has been taken up in an attempt to accomplish this need.

The scope and limit of the present research work is to review critically the main important yogas such as Karma - Yoga, Bhakti - Yoga, and Jnana - Yoga in relation to Advaita, Visistadvaita, Dvaita, and (Acala) Paripurna Rajayoga. And how the Paripurna Rajayoga gives comprehensive and complete knowledge of Brahman is discussed by examining the statements from the Vedas, Upaniṣads, and Bhagavad Gita etc. And the role and place of Paripurna Rajayoga is to be determined.

## REFERENCES

1. Dayananda Ponnala Rajayogi (Trans), Asparsha Yogamune Srimadbhagavad Gita, Rajayogashramam, 1994, P. 29
2. Dayananda Ponnala Rajayogi, Nija Prabodha Vidhanamu, Rajayogashramam, 4th ed, 1993, P. 4
3. ibid, P. 131
4. Radhakrishnan. S, Indian Philosophy, Vol II, 8th impression, 1966, P. 338
5. Dayananda Ponnala Rajayogi, Nija Prabodha Vidhanamu, Rajayogashramam, 4th ed, 1993, P. 59
6. ibid, P. 67
7. ibid, P. 67
8. Karel Werner, Yoga and Indian Philosophy, Motilal Banarsidass, 1980, P.150
9. Dayananda Ponnala Rajayogi, Nija Prabodha Vidhanamu, Rajayogashramam, 4th ed, 1993, P. 67
10. Yilapakurti Vira Venkata Ramachandra Rao, Paripurna Darshanamu, 1st ed, 1965, P. 99
11. ibid, P. 2
12. ibid, P. 2

## **CHAPTER - II**

### **THE MANIFESTATIONS OF VARIOUS SYSTEMS OF YOGA**

## CHAPTER - II

### THE MANIFESTATIONS OF VARIOUS SYSTEMS OF YOGA

Here is an attempt to examine various definitions of Yoga according to different philosophical schools. Four schools viz. Advaita, Viśiṣṭadvaita, Dvaita, and Paripūrṇa Rajayoga are taken in this regard. Every school is directly or indirectly related with at least one of the Yoga systems. First of all the definitions of Yoga in various schools are to be retraced from texts and then those are discussed in detail in relation to their main philosophies.

#### THE YOGA IN RELATION TO ADVAITA:

According to Sri Sankaracarya, the famous exponent of Advaita, Yoga means union of Jiva with Brahman. This was explained by Sankara in his Gita Bhashya.

From the commentary of Sankara on Bhagavad Gita:

"He who performs an action which is his duty, without depending on the result of action, he is a monk and a yogi; (but) not (so is) he who does not keep a fire and is actionless.

"*Anasritah*, without depending on; - on what? -- on that which is *karma-phalam*, the result of action -- i.e. without craving for the result of action - He who craves for the results of actions becomes dependent on the results of actions. But this person is the opposite of such a one.

Hence (it is said), 'without depending on the results of actions'.

"Having become so, *yah*, he who ; *karoti*, performs, accomplishes; (*karma*, an action;) which is his *karyam*, duty, the *nityakarmas* such as Agnihotra etc., which are opposed to the *kamya-karmas*.

"Whoever is a man of action of this kind is distinguished from the other men of action, in order to express this idea the Lord says, *sah*, he; is a *sannyasi*, monk and a *yogi*. Sannyasa means renunciation. He who is possessed of this is a *sannyasi*, a monk. And he is also a *yogi*. Yoga means concentration of mind. He who has that is a *yogi*. It is to be understood that this man is possessed of theses qualities. It is not to be understood that, only that person who does not keep a fire (*niragnih*) and who is actionless (*akriyah*) is a monk and a *yogi*. *Niragnih* is one from whom the fires, which are the accessories of rites, have become dissociated. By *kriya* are meant austerity, charity, etc., which are performed without fire. *Akriyah*, actionless, is he who does not have even such *kriyas*".

"That which they call monasticism, know that to be Yoga, O Pandava. For, nobody who has not given up expectations can be a *yogi*.

"*Yam*, that which is characterized by the giving up of all actions and their result; which *prahuh*, they, the knowers of the Vedas and the Smrtis, call; *sannyasamiti*, monasticism, in the real sense; *viddhi*, know; *tam*, that monasticism in the real sense; to be *yogam*, yoga, consisting in the performance of actions, O Pandava.

"Accepting what kind of similarity between Karma-Yoga, which is characterized by engagement (in actions), and its opposite, renunciation in the real sense, which is characterized by cessation from work, has their equation been stated?

"When such an apprehension arises, the answer is this: From the point of view of the agent, there does exist a similarity of Karma-Yoga

with real renunciation. For he who is a monk in the real sense, from the very fact of his having given up all the means needed for accomplishing actions, gives up the thought of all actions and their results - the source of desire that leads to engagement in work. This Karma-Yogi also, even while performing actions, gives up the thought for results.

"Pointing out this idea, the Lord says; *Hi* for: *kascit*, nobody, no man of action whosoever; a -*sannyasta-sankalpah*, who has not given up expectations - one by whom has not been renounced expectation, anticipation, of results; *bhavati*, becomes i.e., can become; *yogi*, a yogi, a man of concentration, because thought of results is the cause of the disturbance of mind. Therefore, any man of action who gives up the thought of results would become a yogi, a man of concentration with an unperturbed mind, because of his having given up thought of, results which is the cause of mental distractions. This is the purport.

"Thus, because of the similarity of real monasticism with Karma-Yoga from the point of view of giving up by the agent, Karma-Yoga is extolled as monasticism in, 'That which they call monasticism, know that to be Yoga, O Pandava'<sup>2</sup>.

"For the sage who wishes to ascend to (Dhyana-) yoga, action is said to be the means. For that person, when he has ascended to (Dhyana-) yoga, inaction alone is said to be the means.

"*Aruruksoh*, for one who wishes to ascend, who has not ascended, i.e. for that very person who is unable to remain established in Dhyana-yoga;- for which person who is desirous to ascend? - *muneh*, for the sage, i.e.. for one who has renounced the result of actions:- trying to ascend to what? -*yogam* to (Dhyana-) yoga; *karma*, action; *ucyate*, is said to be; the *karanam*, means. *Tasya*, for that person again; *yoga-arudhasya*, when he has ascended to (Dhyana-) yoga, *samah*, inaction, withdrawal from all actions; *eva*, alone; *ucyate*, is said to be; *karanam*, the means for remaining poised in the state of meditation: This is the meaning.



"To the extent that one withdraws from actions, the mind of that man who is at ease and self-controlled becomes concentrated. When this occurs, he at once becomes established in Yoga. And accordingly has it been said by Vyasa: 'For a Brahmana there is no wealth comparable to (the knowledge of) oneness, sameness, truthfulness, character, equipoise, harmlessness, straight forwardness and withdrawal from various actions' "<sup>3</sup>.

After that now is being stated when one becomes established in yoga:

"Verily, when a man who has given up thought about everything does not get attached to sense - objects or actions, he is then said to be established in Yoga.

"*Hiverily: yada*, when; a yogi who is concentrating his mind, *sarva-sankalpa-sannyasi*, who has given up thought about everything - who is apt to give up (*sannyasa*) all (*sarva*) thoughts (*sankalpa*) which are the causes of desire, for things here and hereafter; *na anusajjate*, does not become attached, i.e. does not hold the idea that they have to be done by him; *indriya-arthesu*, with regard to sense-objects like sound etc.; and *karmasu*, with regard to actions - *nitya*, *naimithika*, *kāmya* and *nisiddha* (prohibited) - because of the absence of the idea of their utility; *tada*, then at that time; *ucyate*, he is said to be; *yoga-arudhah.*, established in Yoga, i.e. he is said to have attained to Yoga.

"From the expression, one who has given up thought about everything; it follows that one has to renounce all desires and all actions, for all desires have thoughts as their source. This accords with such Smṛti texts as:

" 'Verily, desire has thought as its source. Sacrifices arise from thoughts'.

" 'O Desire, I know your source, You surely spring from thought. I shall not think of you. So you will not arise in me'.

"And when one gives up all desires, renunciation of all actions becomes accomplished. This agrees with such Upanisadic texts as, ' (This self is identified with desire alone.) What it desires, it resolves; what it resolves, it works out' and also such *Smṛti* texts as 'Whatever actions a man does, all that is the effect of desire itself. It accords with reason also. For when all thoughts are renounced, no one can even move a little. So by the expression, one who has given up thought about everything'; the Lord makes one renounce all desires and all actions.

"When one is thus established in Yoga, then by that very fact one's self becomes uplifted by oneself from the worldly state which is replete with evils"<sup>4</sup>.

"One whose mind is satisfied with knowledge and realization, who is unmoved who has his organs under control, is said to be Self-absorbed. The yogi treats equally a lump of earth, a stone and gold.

"A yogi, *jñāna-vijñāna-trpta-atma*. Whose mind is satisfied with knowledge and realization - *jñāna* is thorough knowledge of things presented by the scriptures, but *vijñāna* is making those things known from the scriptures a subject of one's own realization just as they have been presented; he whose mind (*atma*) has become contented (*trpta*) with those *jñāna* and *vijñāna* is *jñāna-vijñāna-trpta-atma*; *kutasthah*, who is unmoved, i.e., who becomes unshakable; and *vijita-indriyah*, who has his organs under control;- he who is of this kind, *ucyate*, is said to be; *yuktah*, self-absorbed. That yogi *sama-losta-asma-kancanah*, treats equally a lump of earth, a stone and gold"<sup>5</sup>.

"Possessed of wisdom, one rejects here both virtue and vice. Therefore devote yourself to (Karma-) Yoga. Yoga is skilfulness in action.

"Listen to the result that one possessed of the wisdom of equanimity attains by performing one's own duties: *Buddhi-yuktah*, possessed of wisdom, possessed of the wisdom of equanimity; since one *jahati* reject; *iha*, here, in this world ; *ubhe*, both; *sukṛta* - *duṣkṛte*, virtue and vice (righteousness and unrighteousness), through the purification of the

mind and acquisition of Knowledge; *tasmat*, therefore *yujyasva*, devote yourself; *yogaya*, to (karma-) yoga, the wisdom of equanimity. For Yoga is *kausalam*, skilfulness; *karmasu* in action. Skilfulness means the attitude of the skilful, the wisdom of equanimity with regard to one's success and failure while engaged in actions (*karma*) - called one's own duties (*sva-dharma*)- with the mind dedicated to God.

"That indeed is skilfulness which, through equanimity, makes actions that by their very nature bind give up their nature! Therefore, be you devoted to the wisdom of equanimity"<sup>6</sup>.

"One who has his mind Self-absorbed through Yoga, and who has the vision of sameness every where, sees his self existing in everything, and everything in his Self.

"*yoga-yukta-atma*, one who has his mind Self-absorbed through Yoga, whose mind is merged in *samadhi*; and *sarvatra-sama-darsanah*, who has the vision of sameness everywhere - who has the vision (*darsana*) of sameness (*sama-tva*), the knowledge of identity of the Self and Brahman everywhere (*sarvatra*) without exception, in all divergent objects beginning from Brahma to immovable things; *iksate*, sees; *atmanam*, the Self, his own Self; *sarvabhuta-stham*, existing in everything; and *sarva-bhutani*, everything from Brahma to a clump of grass; unified *atmani* in his self"<sup>7</sup>.

The fruit of this realization of the unity of the Self is being stated:

"One who sees Me in everything and sees all things in Me - I do not go out of his vision, and he also is not lost to My vision.

"*Yah*, one who; *pasyati*, sees; *mam*, Me Vasudeva, who am the Self of all; *sarvatra*, in all things; *ca*, and; sees *sarvam*, all things, all created things, beginning from Brahma; *mayi*, in Me who am the Self of all; -- *aham*, I who am God; *na pranasyami*, do not go out; *tasya*, of his vision - of one who has thus realized the unity of the Self, *ca sah*, and he also; *na pranasyati*, is not lost; *me* to My vision. That man of realization does not get lost to Me, to Vasudeva, because of the identity between

him and Me, for that which is called one's own Self is surely dear to one, and since it is I alone who am the seer of the unity of the Self in all"<sup>8</sup>.

Thus one can conclude that the meaning of Yoga, according to Sankara, is the union of Jiva with Brahman (individual soul with universal soul). In Advaita Vedanta Jnana-Yoga occupies the most important position among other yogic systems. According to Sankara, *sādhaka* gets *mōkṣa* through Jnana -Yoga alone it is because the *sādhaka* gets realization of Brahman through Jnana alone. Hence the most priority was given to Jnana-Yoga by Sankara. Hence he said that "the realization of one's identity with Brahman is the cause of liberation from the bonds of *samsāra* by means of which the wise man attains Brahman, the one without a second, the Bliss Absolute"<sup>9</sup>.

### **SANKARA AND HIS ADVAITA:**

SANKARA (788-820 A.D.) was most influential metaphysical theologian in the Hindu tradition. A saivite Brahmin from Kaladi in Cochin, south India, he filled his short life with remarkable intellectual and religious activity. He became an ascetic when he was a boy, and early went to Banaras for study. His chief works, the commentary on the Brahma Sutra and on the ten principal Upanisads, were probably compiled in his youth. He travelled extensively throughout India, engaging in disputations with members of rival schools and trying to reform religious life, notably by establishing an order of ascetics and four important monasteries. Near one of these, in the foothills of the Himalayas, he died.

His interpretation of Hindu theology is known as Advaita Vedanta, since he formulated Vedanta in such a way that there is no distinction between the jiva and Brahman.

The movement he instituted continues, and his followers (the Smartas, followers of smṛti, "tradition") are still numerous. The monastery at Sringeri, whose head leads the south Indian Smartas, is still a centre of learning and pilgrimage. Modern Hindu apologetic, moreover, owes much to Sankara, whose system is the nearest thing to a modern Hindu ideology.

His system depends upon a simple assumption which can be given some scriptural backing from the Upanisads - that the eternal Self (atman) and Brahman, the power underlying and sustaining the empirical cosmos, are identical. This is one interpretation of the famous Upanisadic text "That thou art" (*tat tvam asi*). It follows from Sankara's equation that the apparent multiplicity of selves is an illusion since there is only one ultimate reality, Brahman. Likewise, empirical phenomena, since they appear to be different from the one Absolute, are illusory. Brahman alone exists<sup>10</sup>; and once this has been realized existentially in inner experience, there occurs *moksa* (release).

Sankara did not attempt, as did Nagarjuna, to whose thought he owed much, to show the contradictiveness of ordinary concepts about the world and thus to establish an ineffable Absolute dialectically. (Some of his followers, however, adopted this procedure.) Rather, he argued, first, that his interpretation of revelation (*śruti*) was the correct one; and second, that his solution was not falsified by experience. Thus, his

standpoint was in essence theological, although its bold simplicity, and the force of his arguments in its defence, have conferred on it a strong attraction.

Traditionally Brahman was characterized as *saccidananda* - being, consciousness, and bliss<sup>11</sup>. The last of these three expresses the joy and painlessness of *moksa*, for this involves realization of one's identity with the divine Absolute. Sankara further argued that in perception one is aware of both appearances and an underlying reality. If that reality is one, however, it follows that the multiplicity of phenomena is illusory. Thus, perception involves an intuition of being but for the rest is misleading. We are intuitively aware of Brahman but superimpose upon it characteristics it does not possess. By analogy with illusions, it can be claimed that the whole world as ordinarily encountered is illusory: The experience of release stands to veridical perception as veridical perception does to hallucinations. Consequently, the full understanding of Sankara's system and its verification comes through the nondualistic experience of identity between the Self and Brahman. Thus knowledge, at the higher level, is essentially contemplative, rather than theoretical.

This experience of identity was held to be self-authenticating and not directly communicable - rather, it has to be evoked by, for example, the Vedic identity texts which indicate the essential import of revelation. The two-level theory of truth in Advaita was backed by the use of non-falsification (*abadhiva*) as the criterion of truth. Ordinary, common-sense (*vyavaharika*) knowledge remains veridical until it is falsified by the higher experience of Brahman; illusions, false judgments, and so on at the ordinary level are rightly so called, since they are falsified by later

experience. The ordinary distinction between truth and falsity remains applicable at this level.

The Brahman - atman equation on which Sankara's position rests has two sides. In perceptual experience there is an intuition of the outer side; that is, of pure being as underlying appearances. On the inner side, one is aware of the atman, which has the nature of pure consciousness - the second of the three elements in Brahman. The notion of an ego underlying psychological states is common enough in the Indian tradition, for all orthodox (Hindu) schools affirm such an entity. But Sankara differed from them in denying the plurality of selves. The one Self manifests itself internally as the *saksin* or inner witness which illuminates myriads of psychophysical organisms with consciousness. However, it is theory commonly confused with the empirical ego, and this is the second-the internal-aspect of the grand illusion. Thus both externally, in treating appearances as real, independently of Brahman, and psychologically, in supposing that the empirical ego is real, a person is in the grip of ignorance (*avidya*). This original ignorance is the root of the troubles of living beings, but through spiritual knowledge one removes the veil of nescience. Sankara's denial of a plurality of eternal souls brought him closer to Buddhist thought than any school in the orthodox Hindu tradition. For Sankara, individuality properly belongs only to the transmigrating jiva.

Although the world is, so to say, the product of illusion and ignorance, Sankara did not hold that, strictly speaking, appearances are brought into being by the Absolute or that the self gives rise to ignorance<sup>12</sup>. The state of affairs is beginningless, and all Sankara was

doing was giving an analysis of it. Consequently, questions about the origin of *maya* (the cosmic illusion) are unanswerable, and the nature of *maya* is indefinable<sup>13</sup> - it floats, as it were, between existence and non-existence. But since concepts, like explanations, which are used to deal with phenomena, are necessarily limited to the world of appearances, it is not surprising that the origin of *maya* is inexplicable. However, explanation at the ordinary, common-sense level is in order, and since natural theology is impossible at the higher level, it appears at the lower one. From the standpoint of the ordinary person, immersed in everyday experience, it is correct to view the Absolute as personal God (*Isvara*) and Creator of the world. Thus Sankara had a two-level theory of Brahman. It is qualityless and featureless considered in itself (it is pure being, pure consciousness, and pure bliss), but it manifests itself in a lower way as possessing personal characteristics. The former aspect of the Absolute is *nirgunam*, without attributes; the latter is *sagunam*, with attributes.

The relation between the *Isvara* and the impersonal Brahman can be illustrated in terms of Sankara's cosmology. He made use here of certain Samkhya concepts. The illusion substance, *maya*, takes the place of *Prakrti*, or nature; but the interplay between the three *gunas* (qualities or forces which in unequilibrium interact in such a way that the phenomena of the observable world evolve out of the primary substance, nature) within the *maya* is analogous to the Samkhya scheme<sup>14</sup>. The Lord, in producing the world out of his own substance, himself possesses the *gunas* and thus is *sagunam*, while Brahman considered in itself is *nirgunam*. In brief, the Lord as Creator is implicated in his illusory creation and is, from the standpoint of the higher level, himself illusory.



This synthesis between the doctrine of an absolute and a secondary theism was facilitated by the history of the term *maya*. Although by Sankara's time it definitely meant illusion, as in a conjuring trick, in its earlier use in the orthodox tradition it meant "creative substance"; that is, the potency by which God is able to produce magical transformations of matter, or the matter he uses in creation. The suggestion of magic accounts for the later meaning of "illusion"; but the association of the term with the creative energy of the Lord made it easier for Sankara to present his picture of Brahman, underlying the illusion, as also the creator of the cosmos.

Sankara's view that religion, as well as existence as a whole, can be treated at two levels is one reason for his great contemporary influence, since this key idea (elaborated to include many levels, if necessary) is well suited to express the claims of modern Hinduism to be in the fore-front of a movement to synthesize the various great faiths in the world. If otherwise conflicting beliefs, and practices can be arranged in a hierarchy of levels, two purposes are achieved. First, contradictions between faiths are removed; and second, certain manifestations of religion can be ranked as higher - thus giving Hindu apologetics a clear mode of procedure.

The doctrine of the two levels and the denial of a plurality of eternal selves indicate Sankara's nearness to Buddhist Mahayana metaphysics. Undoubtedly he was influenced by the Madhyamika school, which was founded by Nagarjuna. For this reason he was accused of being a crypto- Buddhist. This appearance of unorthodoxy was accentuated by his treatment of revelation (*sruti*). The two-level principle was applied in

his exegesis of the scriptures. The so-called "works portion" (Karma-Kanda) of revelation, those passages dealing with ritual and social duties, was consigned to the ordinary level, as were references to Brahman as the personal Lord. Thus Sankara's religious aim appeared to transcend orthodox Hinduism, as currently understood. However, the impression of neglect of what he considered lower-level religion is somewhat misleading. Sankara not only spent considerable energies in religious reform, but also was a devotional hymn writer. However, personal religion of this kind, although an important preliminary, was of course superseded in the nondual contemplative experience.

However, the crucial question for Advaita is how the unitary Self becomes associated with a multiplicity of empirical egos. The attempted explanation has two stages. First it must be shown that the Self exists in some sense "in" empirical individuals. Second, some analogy must be produced to show that no contradiction is involved in the notion of one Self in many life monads (Jivas). Once such a coherent account is given, the problem of how the Self comes to be associated with the life monads can be allowed to evaporate. For as we have seen, the existence of *maya* (illusion) and *avidya* (ignorance) is a beginningless fact of life<sup>15</sup>; and all that need be done is to show that the metaphysical analysis of the situation is correct. The problem is not "How came they to be associated?" but rather "how can they be dissociated?"

In the first stage, Sankara argued that we are introspectively aware, by an immediate intuition of an "I" which is prior to all particular contents of consciousness. This subject is never the object of differentiated experience and is thus pure consciousness. Only in the nondual

experience is one able to attain to such a pure consciousness without any overlay of differentiated experience. Assurance that the immediate intuition of the Self is not mistaken can be given by reflecting that the judgment " I doubt the existence of the self " itself presupposes a self to express this doubt. Further if the self is featureless and without differentiations, one cannot separate oneself from another; there is only one Self.

The second stage in the argument involves the search for suitable analogies. The self somehow appears refracted by the *upadhis* (limiting conditions) which constitute each empirical ego. But can this happen without its being broken up, so to speak, into fragments and thereby becoming many? One analogy is that of space. We can speak of the space contained in a jug, but this does not entail that there are many spaces - space continues to be a single whole<sup>16</sup>. Only from a certain point of view can it be regarded as limited by the jug. Thus it is possible to operate with the concept of empirical egos as limiting conditions superimposed on the Self, without running into contradiction. Another analogy used by some Advaitins was that of reflection (*pratibimba*) - the sun, for instance, is mirrored in many pools but remains the same sun<sup>17</sup>. But this analogy scarcely served the Advaitin purpose well, and was indeed made use of by the Dvaita school and others. One can distinguish between the reflections and the source of the reflections, while the whole logic of Sankara's position is to affirm the numerical identity of the Self with what appears to be the plurality of selves.

Provided he can make sense of the relation between the Self and the life monads, Sankara need not say anything further about the origins

of this relationship; but he does need to show how release (*moksa*) is possible, since the whole point of his teachings is to indicate the path to this goal. This is partly a matter of the right spiritual exercises and reflection upon the higher import of revelation, culminating in an intuitive experience of identity with the Absolute. But there is something of a paradox here. Release does not mean that one becomes Brahman. There is no question of changing one's status, but only a change in one's knowledge of that status. However, rebirth of the empirical ego ceases upon the attainment of release. It is at this point that there ought to be a causal relation between Brahman and the empirical world, but the relation between the two is stated by Sankara in a way which seems to exclude this.

The relation is that of appearance (*vivarta*) to reality. Although this Advaitin "appearance theory" is often counted as one of the classical theories of causation in the Indian tradition, strictly speaking, the relation of cause and effect does not apply to that between Brahman and the world of appearances. These concepts belong to the realm of phenomena, which are by definition the objects of empirical or ordinary knowledge. Thus they are not applicable at the higher level. Instead, the Absolute-world relation is conceived by analogy with the perceptual illusion involved in mistaking one object for another; for example, a rope for a snake. The snake appearance is superimposed by the percipient upon the rope and yet would not occur if the rope did not exist. Thus the Brahman-world relation has two features. First, Brahman is cause of the world only in the sense that there would be no world appearance without Brahman (the converse not holding); and second, the world is an appearance superimposed on Brahman. On the other hand, the

world of ordinary experience is orderly and not exactly like a dream or a hallucination, experiences which do not fit in with the rest of experience. This orderliness inherent in physical and psychological phenomena means that they are not absolutely nonexistent. The ambiguous status assigned to *maya* is the reason that Sankara regarded it as indefinable or inexpressible (*anirvacaniya*), and it also accounts for the fact that he did not adopt a subjectivist and solipsistic account of appearances.

The ambivalence between the two levels enabled Sankara to reject the subjective idealist position of the Buddhist Vijñānavādin school. Moreover, the intuition of pure being and of the Self in outer and inner perception, respectively, implies that running through ordinary experience there is an implicit awareness of the Absolute, so that in an important respect ordinary experience is veridical; even from the higher point of view.

In the medieval period Sankara was strongly criticized by Ramanuja and Madhva, the main discussion centring on the questions of whether the notion of two levels of truth is coherent or legitimate, and of whether it is consistent to begin from an intuition of the Self and yet to deny a plurality of selves. These criticisms might be largely motivated by the desire to defend a theistic position against the undervaluation of personal devotion to God entailed by Sankara's position.

So far the theory of Advaita, according to Sankara has been reviewed. Here in relation to yogic view, the Advaita gives the most priority for Jñāna - Yoga. According to Sankara Bhakti - Yoga is not possible because there is no difference between Jiva and Brahman to

get liberation from *samsara*. According to Advaita Vedanta, true knowledge is the real means of liberation since the veil of ignorance can be removed only by *tattva-jnana* and not by anything else. Disinterested action as a prior condition purifies the mind and makes it fit for gaining true knowledge. Thus it is a remote condition and not the immediate antecedent of liberation. In fact, when knowledge (Jnana) is acquired, the wise man loses completely body sense and ego-feeling which are necessary for worldly actions. Hence like a lion and a deer, action and knowledge cannot exist together. Since action (Karma-Yoga) possesses purifying capacity, its performance in a proper spirit leads one to *Pitrloka* and *Satya loka* respectively, but cannot release him permanently from the suffering of life and the agonies of worldly existence. Devotion or Bhakti - Yoga too, according to Advaita Vedanta cannot lead us to supreme goal, Bhakti - Yoga is directed towards a lower Brahman and hence it, too, cannot bring about the eternal bliss which results solely from a feeling of identity with the supreme and unqualified Brahman.

Karma-Yoga and Bhakti-Yoga cannot therefore be direct means of emancipation which can be brought about by Jnana-Yoga alone according to Sankara's Advaita.

### **THE YOGA IN RELATION TO VISISTADVAITA:**

According to Ramanujacarya, the famous exponent of Visistadvaita, Yoga means the vision of the self. This word was explained in his Gita Bhasya in the following way: "When your intellect, well enlightened by hearing from Me and firmly placed, stands unshaken in a concentrated

mind, then you will attain the vision of the self.

"Here *Sruti* means hearing (and not the Veda). When you intellect, which by hearing from us, has become specially enlightened, having for its object the eternal, unsurpassed and subtle self - which belongs to a class different from all other entities - then the intellect is firmly fixed, i.e., in a single psychosis and stand unshaken. In such a concentrated mind, purified by the performance of duties without attachment, will be generated true Yoga, which consists in the vision of the self. What is said is this: Karma - Yoga which presupposes the knowledge of the real nature of the self obtained from the scriptures, leads to a firm devotion to knowledge known as the state of firm wisdom; and the state of firm wisdom; which is in the form of devotion to knowledge, generates the vision of the self; this vision is here called Yoga"<sup>18</sup>.

"He who performs works that ought to be done without seeking their fruits - he is a Sannyasin and Yogin, and not he who maintains no sacred fires and performs no actions.

"He who, without depending on such fruits of works as heaven etc., performs them reflecting, 'The performance of works alone is my duty (*karya*). Works themselves are my sole aim, because they are a form of worship of the Supreme Person who is our Friend in every way. There is nothing other than Him to be gained by them' - such a person is a Sannyasin, i.e., one devoted to Jnana Yoga, and also a Karma Yogin i.e. one devoted to Karma Yoga. He is intent on both these, which is the means for attaining Yoga, which is of the nature of the vision of the self.

" 'And not he who maintains no sacred fires and performs no works', i.e., not he who is disinclined to perform the enjoined works such as sacrifices, etc., nor he who is devoted to mere knowledge. The meaning is that such a person is devoted only to knowledge, whereas a person who is devoted to Karma Yoga has both knowledge and works"<sup>19</sup>.

Hence from above commentary of Ramanujacarya, it is known that Yoga is the vision of the self. But there is no unification of Jiva with Brahman because Jiva and Brahman are different entities even though there is oneness between them. Ramanuja gave priority to only Bhakti - Yoga which consists Jnana and Karma together unlike Sankara.

### **RAMANUJA AND HIS VISISTADVAITA:**

RAMANUJA (1017 - 1137 A.D.) a south Indian Brahmin, was born in Bhutapuri and studied with the teacher Yamuna (tenth-eleventh centuries). Ramanuja owed something to the Bhedabheda ("Identity - in - Difference") school of Indian Philosophy and to the fervently devotional poetry of the Tamil religious poets known as the Alvars. His chief work was his commentary on the Brahma-Sutras; other important works were the Vedarthasamgraha and the Vedantasara.

Ramanuja became the chief exponent and virtual founder of the Vedanta school of Hinduism known as Visistadvaita (Qualified Nondualism) which expressed a religious reaction against Sankara's Nondualism. Ramanuja wished to show that there exists a distinction between the self (atman) or eternal soul and ultimate reality, that is, between atman and Brahman. This distinction makes sense of the religion of worship and devotion to which Ramanuja was committed, for the devotee cannot think of the Person whom he worships as identical with himself - a sense of separation and distinction is phenomenologically central to this form of religion. Furthermore, Sankara's monism contained philosophical difficulties which Ramanuja sought to expose. On the other hand, he recognized the monistic character of certain key



passages in revelation (*sruti*), which implied that the self and Brahman are in some sense one. Thus, his system was conceived as one in which it was possible to show that distinctions between selves, the world, and God were maintained and yet at the same time the three categories were in some sense a unity. He achieved this goal in an ingenious way, replacing Sankara's idealism with a form of realism. His system was further elaborated by his successors, notably Venkatanatha (1268-1369 A.D.).

Given that the world and a plurality of selves are real and yet also that they are in some way identical with, or united with, God<sup>20</sup>, Ramanuja was not content, as the Bhedabheda school tended to be, to affirm both sides of an apparent contradiction. He wished to show that a sensible account can be given of how the Absolute embraces both what changes and what is changeless. He approached this problem through an analysis of the relation between body and soul (self). There is an extensive discussion in Visistadvaitic literature of the correct definition of "body". The definition arrived at has two facets. One refers to the causal relation between soul and body and the other to the conceptual relation.

First, when a person is said to possess a body, it is implied that the body subserves the soul - that the movements of the body are controlled by the soul. Certain modifications of this aspect of the definition are needed for example, a servant is controlled by his master: but he is not the latter's body, since some of his acts are not controlled by the master. By analogy, the material cosmos and souls are the body of God, since they are governed by him and a teleological account of material changes in his "body" is given. Ramanuja conceived of matter

as possessing a fine or subtle form and a gross form. The Lord, in his creative activity, brings the subtle form into a state of actualization. Likewise, he controls souls and brings about their release. Thus, from the causal point of view, the body is defined as instrumental to a soul; and the world likewise is an instrument of God.

From the conceptual point of view, Ramanuja held that body and soul are inseparable. That is, not merely is there a continuous association between body and soul so that they are never in fact separated, but also they are mutually definable. By definition, a body is of some self; and by definition, a self is something having a body. This relation is one-many, in that selves transmigrate, but because of Ramanuja's doctrine of inseparability (*aprthaksiddhi*) it is held that even in *moksa* (release) a liberated self has a (suitably refined) body. At any given time is a one-one correlation between a body and its soul.

However, both aspects of the definition so far fail to show properly the difference in character between the self and its body. It is therefore necessary to add the further proviso that the self has experiences, while the body does not - although it conditions the experiences of the self. A self always has experiences from a certain point of view, and it is by the body that this point of view is determined. Finally, it may be noted that the term used here for "body" (*sarira*) means primarily an organic body rather than simply a material object.

As a person is indivisible, in Ramanuja's account, and yet has two aspects-his consciousness and bodily state so the Absolute is, by this, both supreme self (God as Lord) and cosmos. Yet he is supposedly

changeless, while the cosmos clearly includes changes within it. It is argued that locutions like "I know such and such" presuppose a self as knower. Personal identity cannot rest on memory states, however, since these themselves presuppose a continuity in personal identity. It follows that something changeless underlies such psychical changes. By analogy, God is the pure, changeless supreme Self<sup>21</sup>. Although in this respect he is unchanging, changes occur in the Lord's "body", the cosmos. Thus he can, without contradiction, be conceived of as both changing and changeless. Ramanuja and his successors also used the notion of substance and its attributes to illustrate the relation between God and the cosmos. A substance can, for the purposes of analysis, be distinguished from its changing qualities. The distinction, although conceptually possible - and, indeed, necessary - does not entail that there can be qualityless substances or substanceless qualities.

Ramanuja also wished to show, in opposition to Sankara, that there are many finite selves distinguished from each other and from God<sup>22</sup>. This induced a complication in his body-self analogy. Thus, he evolved a dual theory: not only is the material cosmos God's body, but so also are individual selves; and God acts from within souls as their *antaryamin*, or inner controller. This tied in with Ramanuja's insistence on God's grace as operative toward salvation. His successors were divided between a strong interpretation of this notion (salvation is due solely to God's activity) and a weak interpretation (salvation requires cooperation on the part of the individual with God's grace).

Ramanuja's cosmology made use of Samkhya concepts. Nature (*Prakṛti*) was given a theistic interpretation, as the body of God. In

Samkhya, atomism, as a cosmological hypothesis, was rejected in favour of the doctrine of a unitary material substrate which evolves into the gross forms of substance encountered in perceptual experience. However, Ramanuja did hold that selves are atomic (Indian thought tended to vacillate between treating selves as all-pervasive and as atomic) on two grounds: first, non-infinitesimal finite entities were considered to be perishable; second, the self is not easily given the attributes of extension. However, it was then necessary for Ramanuja to show how the infinitesimal self (having no extension, but location) is connected with the body for the sensations are felt in different parts of the body. The Visistadvaitins introduced a bridge entity to close this gap, the attributive intelligence (*dharma-bhutajnana*), which is capable of extension. This also served a theological purpose. The Lord's attributive intelligence pervades the whole cosmos. In the state of liberation, moreover, the self puts off its limitations and becomes all-pervasive through its attributive intelligence. It is thus god like in the state of salvation. Thus Ramanuja was able to interpret the so-called identity texts in revelation, such as *tattvam asi* ("That thou art") as meaning that the self and God are intrinsically similar<sup>23</sup>. But the self, although godlike, remains dependent on God. However, with a certain magnanimity, Ramanuja allowed a lower form of release for those who seek identity with Brahman. Their souls stay in a state of painless isolation but do not realize the highest happiness, communion with the Lord.

In relation to yogic view, the Visistadvaita gives the highest priority to Bhakti - Yoga. According to Ramanuja Bhakti - Yoga alone leads to liberation from *samsara*. As a theist, Ramanuja believes that salvation is possible, not through Jnana and Karma, but through Bhakti and

*prasada*<sup>24</sup> (*grace*). Jnana, in the scriptures, stands for *dhyana*, or meditation, and *nididhyasana* or concentrated contemplation. Bhakti is gained through concentration on the truth that God in our innermost self and that we are but modes of his substance. But such Jnana cannot be had unless the bad Karma is destroyed. Work undertaken in a disinterested spirit helps to remove the past accumulations. Ramanuja differs from Advaita-Vedanta in holding that disinterested performance of action promotes devotion and so actions should be performed in an unselfish manner till salvation is not attained<sup>25</sup>. So long as Karma enjoined in the scriptures is undertaken with a selfish motive, the end cannot observances are transitory, while the result of knowledge of god is indestructible (*aksaya*); but if we perform work in the spirit of dedication to god it helps us in our effort after salvation<sup>26</sup>. Work performed in a such spirit develops *sattva* nature and helps the soul to see the truth of things. The two, Jnana and Karma, are means to Bhakti, or the power which tears up our selfishness by the roots, gives new strength to the will, new eyes to the understanding and new peace to soul. So according to Ramanuja, Bhakti-Yoga constitutes the principal means and knowledge (Jnana-Yoga) and action (Karma-Yoga) are its two essential and non-separable auxiliaries.

Moreover in Ramanuja's Visistadvaita, one more yoga system is added - Prapatti-Yoga or unreserved resignation to the Lord. It is such resignation that evokes God's grace, which alone can eradicate the load of Karma that persists from time without beginning.

Bhakti-Yoga is an approach to God through philosophical knowledge, action, love, respect whereas Prapatti-Yoga is an approach

to God through faith and selfless love accompanied by an attitude of self surrender and resignation.

## **THE YOGA IN RELATION TO DVAITA:**

According to Madhvacarya, the famous exponent of Dvaita, Yoga means the discharge of duties only meant to be offered in worship to the Lord.

This was explained by Madhva in his Bhagavad Gita Bhashya. From his Gita Bhashya: "Taking thy stand on Yoga do the duties, O Dhananjaya, renouncing attachment, being alike in success and failure; (this) state of being alike is called Yoga.

"Yoga is the path to knowledge. To take one's stand on Yoga is to pursue that path. Renouncing attachment to the fruits of Karma (the duties performed); and there by being alike, i.e., being equally unaffected by success or failure; do thy duties for the sake of the Lord's grace.

"The last clause is a succinct definition of Yoga setting forth its essential characteristic. Its definition is intended to prevent the mistake of taking Yoga to be either 'renunciation' or 'being alike unaffected by success or failure'. The latter is the essential characteristic while renunciation is at the root of it. Therefore the full definition of Yoga is the possession of equanimity attended with renunciation.

"It has been said that the fruits of Karma are trifling when compared with those of knowledge, and that therefore the means of knowledge should be sought for and practised. It is further pointed out here below that in leading to the highest end of man, Karma as a means is far inferior to knowledge"<sup>27</sup>.

"With knowledge (of God) he casts off here both good and evil

(deeds); therefore exert thyself for the Yoga (means of knowledge); (for) the Yoga is the most efficacious in midst of duties.

"Good and evil: the merit and demerit which one has acquired by good and evil deeds. Of merit the wise man allows to perish all that which leads to birth and death and other undesirable results. But he does not allow to perish whatever merit resulting from meditation and other pure deeds may enhance the light of knowledge and the state of blessedness in heaven: whereas he casts off absolutely all demerit. Thus wisdom leads to the great results of saving him from all evil and of adding to both his knowledge and bliss. So Arjuna is asked to gird himself to walk in the path of knowledge and spare no effort in that direction. Surely Yoga is indispensable. But what for is the performance enforced of Karma without attachment to fruits? The last clause says: The Yoga i.e., duties done for the sake of the Lord's Grace with the knowledge of His greatness and without any longing for the fruits is really skill in the performance of duties, as it leads to everlasting consequence. This indeed is the Yoga; for only the duty performed without motives is the means of knowledge"<sup>28</sup>.

The means and effect of knowledge are explained here.

"Those who gain knowledge (by) renouncing the fruit of Karma, surely become wise and released from bonds of birth and attain to the goal beyond misery.

"Renouncing ..... *Karma* means and includes renouncing the fruit of Karma, the wish for it. Those (1) who practise the Yoga or such duties only as are offered to the Lord, (2) who from a true insight into the Sastras see the Lord and His Greatness, (3) who by virtue of these gain knowledge attain wisdom or direct perception of the Truth, -- those become liberated from the bonds of birth and attain to the goal, the Moksa, where there is no fear of misery. The first two clauses state the means, viz. the discharge of duties free of motives and the perfect and accurate understanding of the Sastras. The remaining clauses state the results, viz., wisdom, and its fruit the Moksa"<sup>29</sup>.

Here is the question that for how long one should practice such duties.

"When thy mind shall get over the evil of misapprehension, then shalt thou attain to the full benefit of what has been heard and should be heard.

"What has ..... heard includes all the duties performed and to be performed.

"The etymology of *Nirveda* is here different from that of the word in common use. This use is met with in the *Sruti*, '*Pandityam Nirvidya Balyena Tishtha set*'. It here means the full benefit to be gained and comes from, *Nis + vid* (to obtain). In the other sense the word should construe with the ablative case. Moreover the other sense, if taken here, would involve many inconsistencies.

"The Yoga of practising Nivrtta Karma which leads to the wisdom of perception necessary for release is directly the means of knowledge. Study and other means of knowledge promote only the unseen merit and thereby purify the mind; hence these are accessories to wisdom in as much as they help him out of doubt and misapprehension"<sup>30</sup>.

What is that evil of misapprehension and what the way to get over it? With a description of men in different stages, the lowest, the middling and the highest, the same Yoga is further explained thus:

"When thy reason at conflict with *Srutis* shall stand unshaken (and) when in deep meditation it shall be unperturbed, then shalt thou attain unto Yoga.

"Before conclusive knowledge is obtained through *Sastras* and observation, reason is at conflict with the teachings of the *Sruti*. But when it grows reconciled to the *Sruti*, it arrives at the true conclusion and the full certainty of its genuine teaching; then it becomes incapable



of being shaken or assailed by wrong views or doubts. Subsequently arises the capacity for deep meditation; when this becomes intensified to the utmost and everything outside is incapable of intruding upon the mind, the Lord reveals Himself to the soul. The glorious sight immerses him in supreme bliss so deep that he cannot be disturbed and roused to the world outside even by the loudest thunders rolling over his head; for he is all attention upon the Lord. Then, it is properly said, he attains to the full benefit of the *yoga* inculcated here.

"The Yoga practised in the earliest stage gives him the certainty as to the nature of the Lord in so far as it may be gained by all the external means of the *Sastras*, observation and precept. The certainty becoming intense steadies his belief against all attacks of doubt and misapprehension and all trials it may be put to in the midst of conflicting theories. In this stage the Yoga takes the form of *Nivṛtta*. Karma or performance of duties for their own sake arms him with capacity for deep contemplation whereby he comes directly to perceive the Gracious Lord. The perception becoming developed and steadied confers on him that state of being deeply immersed in the light of the Lord and the consequent bliss from which nothing can wake him to external objects.

"Now we get at the following clear notions. The evil of misapprehension consists in the fault of the mind (reasoning), that it is opposed to Vedic conclusions. To get over that evil is to make the mind perfectly appreciate the reasonableness of Vedic teaching and to firmly establish that belief in it.

"Another interpretation: To translate the verse again; When thy reason is highly accordant with *Sruti* and stands unshaken, (and) meditation becomes possible, direct perception arises, reason becomes stable; (and) then thou shalt attain unto *Yoga*, i.e., reach the Lord"<sup>31</sup>.

Hence from the commentary of Madhva on Bhagavad Gita, it is known that Yoga is not the union of Jiva and Brahman but the Yoga i.e.,

duties done for the sake of the Lord's Grace with the knowledge of His greatness and without any longing for the fruits is really skill in the performance of duties, as it leads to everlasting consequence. This indeed is the Yoga; for only the duty performed without motives is the means of knowledge.

### **MADHVA AND HIS DVAITA:**

MADHVA (1238-1317 A.D.), historical founder of the Dvaita system, was born in Udipi, near Mangalore on the west coast of India. The extant accounts of his life are largely legendary (some of the incidents resemble New Testament miracles, one reason why some have detected Christian influences upon him). He devoted his life to combating Sankara's doctrines in favour of Vaisnavaite devotionalism. In this he resembled Ramanuja, and his philosophical views were subservient to this main spiritual interest. His chief works include important commentaries on the Brahma-Sutra and the Bhagavad Gita, as well as other religious, metaphysical and logical treatises.

The structure of his system depends on an ontological distinction of three kinds of entities-life monads or souls (*jiva*), nonintelligent substances (*acit*), and God (*Isvara*). In addition, Madhva held that the cosmos (which is a complex conglomeration of nonintelligent substances) has nature (*Prakrti*) as its material cause - a concept whose chief function was to oppose the suggestion that God is the material cause of the world<sup>32</sup>, a doctrine held by some schools. Madhva's view was borrowed from the Samkhya school of Indian philosophy and he also took over other elements from the evolutionary cosmology of that school.

The distinction between God and the souls accounts for the fact that Madhva's system is known as Dualism (Dvaita), in opposition to the Advaita (Nondualism) of Sankara. However, Madhva was also concerned to stress the distinction between souls and nonintelligent substances and worked with a five fold set of distinctions: God-soul; soul-soul; God-material substance; material substance-material substance; soul-material substance. While Ramanuja considered souls as numerous but essentially alike (so that they become qualitatively indistinguishable in a state of release), Madhva held that each soul has its own peculiar properties.

This was one reason for his theory of relative particulars (*visesa*). He objected to the doctrine of real universal and considered that qualities belonging to substances are aspects peculiar to them. In so far as we use general terms, it is because the aspects of different substances are similar. (It was objected by Madhva's opponents that similarity itself must be a universal. His reply was that each case of similarity is unique-thus the similarity of A to B differs from the similarity of B to A). On the other hand, one cannot identify the aspect with the substance, for then a change in quality would entail the disappearance of the substance. Thus a substance can be regarded as a combination of particular aspects relative to the point of view from which we describe it. Every substance stands in relation to a host of others, so that a full description of its qualities must take account of these complex relationships. However, it would be fallacious to think that because the qualities of a substance are determined by its causal and other relations, they do not properly belong to it. Since each entity has a different location in the whole structure of substances, it has its own peculiar character as determined by its relationships. This general thesis, it should be noted, applies to

God and souls as much as to inanimate entities.

All this implies that there are ineluctable, if often very subtle, divergences between all entities in the universe. Hence, Madhva felt justified in adopting a radically pluralistic account of the substances in the cosmos as well as a doctrine of the sharp distinction between God and other entities<sup>33</sup>. The most important characteristic distinguishing the Lord (*Isvara*) from the world and souls is that he is self-dependent (*aparatantra*), while they are dependent on him. This distinction has two main applications. First, at a period when the cosmos is dissolved back into chaos (in accordance with the common Indian belief that the cosmos is "pulsating" a period of organization being followed by one of chaos, and so on), nature (*Prakṛti*) is catalysed into a fine powdery substance, or virtual chaos, having only the property of generating instants of time. Thus, the material entities of the cosmos are subject to transformation through the creative, sustaining, and destructive power of God. On the other hand, God is changeless not liable to evolutionary transformation. He affects the world but is not affected by it.

Second, the relation between God and souls is rather different. Regardless of the ignorance (*avidya*) and materiality with which they are obscured and entangled during the process of transmigration, souls are internally changeless. Thus, the difference between the Lord and the cosmos does not hold in this case. However, the destinies of souls, and the ways in which they manifest themselves, are determined by God. It is God who determines whether a soul attains release (*moksa*) and what its status therein shall be; and it is God who operates the powers of ignorance and materiality which implicate them in the round

of rebirth. Thus, the circumstances of the souls, in regard to what they suffer or enjoy, are affected by God; but the circumstances of the Lord in these respects are not affected by the souls or by other substances in the cosmos (indeed, the souls are strictly inactive, for their destiny is worked out through their karma, in accordance with their particular natures; and God is the controller of karma).

While for Ramanuja the difference between selves is due to the operation of karma as an expression of God's will, the Dvaitins held that the differences in the destinies of different individuals can be explained through their individual idiosyncrasies. Each self has certain intrinsic properties which necessarily determine its course of existence. God, in governing and controlling the cosmos, arranges the destinies of souls in accordance with their patterns of existence.

For instance, in accordance with a common Indian conception, the cause of the soul's being bound to the round of rebirth is ignorance - lack of spiritual perception and detachment. In contrast to Sankara, who conceived of *avidya* as a unitary cosmic phenomenon (the subjective correlate of *maya*, illusion), Madhva conceived more naturalistically of each person's ignorance as being peculiar to him. Thus God's imposition of ignorance on a life monad does not involve foisting upon it a spiritual darkness foreign to it. Moreover, he held that there are various grades of release - and of non-release<sup>34</sup>. Uniquely among Indian teachers, he held that some selves are destined for everlasting punishment in hell (Indian hells are normally more in the nature of purgatories, so that the soul is ultimately reborn in another state). Also some souls will go on transmigrating forever, without arriving either at release or at everlasting

punishment.

The doctrine of predestination to eternal punishment is one reason why some have suspected Christian influences on Madhva. Certainly, in the area where he was brought up there were Christian communities. Further, Madhva taught, at the mythological level, that the god Vayu (literally, "wind" - thus there is an analogy to the Holy spirit) is a principal intermediary between the Lord and men. Also, a biography represents Madhva as walking on water. However, there are other ways of explaining these similarities to Christianity. Vayu is a Vedic deity and has nothing historically to do with the Holy Spirit. Legendary miracles of all sorts abound in Indian literature. Madhva's predestinationism is more easily accounted for in terms of the internal dynamics of his system. Given that destinies differ, it is not surprising that some individuals should achieve the worst possible fate (with certain appropriate variations).

Like Ramanuja and in opposition to the illusionism of Sankara's Advaita Vedanta, Madhva was committed to the self-authentication of common-sense knowledge. He held that there is an inner faculty, the apperceiver or witness (*saksi*), which passes final judgment on what is presented in sense perception and induction (since methods of induction always leave room for marginal doubt and, theoretically, perception can be hallucinatory). The *saksi* is, further, the source of intuitive knowledge, such as of the self and of the space and time. The concept of the *saksi* was one of Madhva's means of resisting skeptical arguments and of validating his realistic pluralism.

It is worth noting that although, superficially, Madhva's doctrines are nearer to orthodox theism in the Christian tradition than are Ramanuja's (the latter can be interpreted in a pantheistic sense), Ramanuja's strong insistence on grace, and the Dualist doctrine that the Lord assigns destinies in accordance with the particular natures of souls, mean that there is a stronger sense of dependence in Visistadvaita than in Dvaita. This is reflected religiously in the fact that Madhva stressed not merely the practice of devotion (Bhakti - Yoga) but also inner contemplation, a practice which elsewhere in the Indian tradition tends to ignore or modify doctrines of a supreme personal Lord and to be associated with a doctrine of the self-sufficiency of the aspirant. Naturally, however, Madhva interpreted such contemplation as bringing one close to God.

From his theory of Dvaita, it is known that Madhva has given importance to Bhakti-Yoga. The definition of Bhakti - Yoga in his words: "That firm and unshakable love of God, which rises above all other ties of love and affection based upon an adequate knowledge and conviction of His great majesty, is called "Bhakti - Yoga". That alone is the means of *moksa*. And Madhva has given a unique place to Divine grace<sup>35</sup> in his Bhakti - Yoga.

### **THE YOGA IN RELATION TO PARIPURNA RAJAYOGA:**

According to Sri Dayananda Ponnala Rajayogi, the famous exponent of (Acala) Paripurna Rajayoga, who belonged <sup>to</sup> 20th century and Andhra Pradesh, Yoga means system of practise of actions without assuming doer-ship. '*Kartṛtva rahita karmacarana yogamani nimayamu*.

*Adhistana paramatma yokka samistirupamagu samabhavamu yogamu ani nirnayamu. Trikarana suddhiyuta karttva rahita karmacaranaye karmalayandali kausalamu*<sup>66</sup>. That means the system of practise of actions without assuming doer-ship along with *trikarana suddhi* is the skilfulness in performing the actions and that is called real Yoga.

In other words, Yoga is the view of equality (*samadarsana*) of universal form of *Adhistana* Brahman. '*samam yogamucyate*'.

According to Vemana, the another famous exponent of Paripurna Rajayoga, who belonged to 15th century, Yoga means '*urakunta deliya uttama yogambu*' which means know the things and practise the actions without assuming the doer-ship. This is the best or a first class yoga in his view. It was explained in his following verse.

*'urakunta deliya uttama yogambu  
manasambu kalimi madhyamambu  
asanadi vidhulu adhama yogambura  
visvadhahirama vinura vema*<sup>37</sup>

(English translation of C P Brown for this verse is not available.) And the Yoga which is related with mind such as *dhyana* (concentration or meditation) is a middle class yoga. The yoga which is of physical postures (*asanas*) etc., is a third class yoga. (In researcher's translation.)

The meaning of Yoga in his other verses:



*'pagalu reyi juda bhavambu lopala  
danu nenu yanedi talapu maraci  
yunna yatti yatadu yuttama yogira  
visvadabhira vinura vema'*

"He who daily and highly considers and forgets from his mind the distinctions of I and thou and he that thus liveth is the noble ascetic"<sup>38</sup> - C.P. Brown's translation for the above verse of Vemana.

*'lonu bayalu jesi lokambu degatarci  
kulamu gala betti gunamu vadali  
cinta loni cinta jerina yogira  
visvadabhira vinura vema'*

"He who maketh his in most mind pure (or who maketh his inside his out side) and slays all worldliness burneth his caste and casting off all qualities hath attained the reflection of reflections. He is the devotee"<sup>39</sup> - C.P. Brown's translation for the above verse of Vemana.

*'tana nijarupamu judanu  
tana mayanu buttu tanadu tanuvani cucun  
tanalone tatva sampada  
ganu vade parama yogi gadara vema'*

C.P. Brown's translation for above verse: " When we see our true figure shall we see truly that our body is born of delusion. He alone who beholdeth within himself the possession of the truth, this is the *parama - yogi*"<sup>40</sup>.

These four verses are also giving the meaning of Yoga that Yoga is the state of doing actions without assuming doer-ship. This state exceeds the difference between Jiva and Brahman. The Yogi who practises this Yoga transcends all the duals such as night and day, self (jiva) and Brahman, *guna* (*dharma*) and Karma etc.

According to Sri Bhagavata Krishna Desikulu, the famous exponent of Paripurna Rajayoga, who belonged to 19th century, Yoga in his words, means: '*Sangaphala tyaga silataya ceyabadinativanti svabhavaniyata karmacarana siddhiye yogamu. Sangame stula sariramu, phalame suksma sariramu. yee rentiki karanamu viksepamu. viksepame sankalpamu. Sankalpame sangaphalam. Viti yokka tyagame sangaphalatyagamu. Tadvare ceyabadinativanti svabhava karmacarana siddhiye yogamu*'<sup>41</sup>. The state of actions practised by *sanga phalatyaga* (renunciation of physical and subtle bodies) and *svabhavaniyata* (with determination of harmless self) is called Yoga. This is again nothing but practising all the actions without assuming doer-ship.

Hence one can conclude that according to Paripurna Rajayoga the meaning of Yoga is '*Karttva rahita karmacarana*' the state of practising of all the actions without assuming the doer-ship but with *trikarana suddhi*.

## **DAYANANDA PONNALA RAJAYOGI AND HIS PARIPURNA RAJAYOGA:**

DAYANANDA PONNALA RAJAYOGI (1899-1985 A.D.), one of the famous exponents of Paripurna Rajayoga, re-established and revived

the Paripurna Rajayoga in the time period 1930-1985 A.D. He was born in a middle class *munuru kapu* family in Secunderabad, Andhra Pradesh, India in 1899 A.D. He was trained in this yoga system by his master Bhumananda Hanumantha Rajayogi. His chief works were the commentaries on " Bhagavad Gita", "*Suddha nirguna tatva kandartha darvulu*", and "*Ksaraksaropadhi dvaya dosa rahita parama tatva kanda padyamulu*" (The latter two books were written by Bhagavata Krishna Desikulu, a famous exponent of this yoga, belonged to 19th century A. D.). The other books which were systematically written by him to explain Paripurna Rajayoga were: 1. *Nija Prabodha Vidhanamu (Rajayogeeyamu)*. 2. *Rajayoga smrti chandrika* 3. *Sampradayaka Paripurna Prabodhini*. 4. *Ananyacala Paripurna Prabodhini*. 5. *Tarakamrta Paramahansa Prabodhini*. 6. *Paripurna Rajavidya Rajaguhya sikhamani*. All these works were in Telugu language. His theory of Paripurna Rajayoga imbibes all Indian Philosophical Systems. Because it is beyond of all religious and philosophical systems. In his theory, the ultimate absolute reality i.e. Paripurna Brahman is beyond of the Brahman of Sankara, Ramanuja, and Madhva. According to Paripurna Rajayoga the Brahman of either Sankara or Ramanuja or Madhva is a relative one. The Brahman of Sankara or Ramanuja or Madhva is real cause of the world and that Brahman is called Yeruka in his theory. This Brahman is completely different from Paripurna Brahman and there is no link and relation between them. So the most important thing is that there are two Brahmans according to him.

One is Paripurna Brahman and the other is Brahman (Yeruka) or *Adhistana Cetana* Brahman<sup>42</sup>. In these the Paripurna Brahman is absolute and it is not the cause of this world. But the Brahman is the real

cause of this world and it is a relative one. It is both the efficient and material cause of this world. And only the world is no illusion.

The Brahman (Yeruka) and the world are two sides of one coin. They are one and same. In his theory the world is as true as the Brahman, but not *mithya* as in the case of Sankara. His theory did not accept superimposition<sup>43</sup> (*vivarta vada*) of Sankara's Advaita. Gaudapada's *ajatavada* was also not agreed by Rajayogi because the Brahman (Atman) is the real cause of the world according to him. He raises the point that there is an *apavada* (error) in Sankara's *vivarta vada*.

According to Rajayogi, Brahman (Visnu in the view of Ramanuja) and jiva (individual self) are one and same<sup>44</sup>. Therefore there is no *antaryamin* concept in Paripurna Rajayoga. Hence there is no requirement of God's grace as operative toward salvation in Paripurna Rajayoga.

The individual selves (jivas) are none other than Brahman (Yeruka). Ramanuja did hold that selves are atomic. But according to Paripurna Rajayoga selves are atomic as well as infinite. The nature (*prakrti*) is also none other than Brahman<sup>45</sup>. The consciousness (soul) and unconsciousness (matter) are inseparable. Soul is atomic as a jiva (individual soul) as well as infinite as Brahman (universal soul). In the view of Rajayogi, Jiva (individual soul) - Isvara (God or Brahman or universal soul) - Jagat (the world) is only one substance which is inseparable<sup>46</sup>. This contradicts with the theory of Madhva also. Madhva preached five differences between

1. God (Brahman) - Soul (individual self)
2. Soul (individual self)-Soul (individual self)
3. God (Brahman) - Material substance
4. Material substance - Material substance
5. Soul (individual self) - Material substance

According to Madhva Brahman (God) is not the material cause of the world but It is only efficient cause and nature (*Prakṛti*) is the material cause. This is not true according to Paripurna Rajayoga. Brahman (God) and *Prakṛti* (Nature) are not different from each other. So the Brahman is the both material and efficient cause of the world<sup>47</sup>. It is God who determines whether a soul attains release (*mokṣa*) and what its status there in shall be; and it is God who operates the powers of ignorance and materiality which implicate them in the round of rebirth according to Madhva. But in Paripurna Rajayoga, all this is not dependent on God but solely on individual. The *saksi* of Madhva is not different from individual self (Jiva) or Atman<sup>48</sup>.

Ramanuja's strong insistence on God's grace and Madhva's statement that the Lord assigns destinies in accordance with particular natures of Souls will not show the absolute Brahman (Paripurna Brahman) of Paripurna Rajayoga. While Sankara gave priority for Jnana-Yoga, Ramanuja and Madhva gave priority for Bhakti-Yoga, Paripurna Rajayoga gives equal priority for Karma-Yoga, Bhakti-Yoga, and Jnana-Yoga as they are not different but rather complementary to one another and harmonic coordination of all these yogic systems leads to a complete yogic view.

The three religious systems established by Sankara, Ramanuja, and Madhva may be true according to their reference frames. But their theories are not absolute theories. They are partially correct. The absolute theory (Paripurna Rajayoga) is to be understood where all other theories merge into it. One ultimate truth was said in the Vedas, Upanisads, Brahma-Sutras and Bhagavad Gita etc., but it was understood by three masters of three religions in different angles. According to their personal opinions, they interpreted the Prasthanatraya. The commentaries made by Sankara, Ramanuja, and Madhva are completely opposing one another's statements in major issues. There by they created chaos in history of Indian philosophy. But truth is one and that has been handed over from generation to generation in the form of *Guru-Sampradaya* as Paripurna Rajayoga since the time immemorial. The ultimate absolute reality, Paripurna Brahman cannot be perceivable. It is inexplicable by tongue<sup>49</sup>. And it is unfathomable to mind also. Hence it is beyond all the religious concepts. This Paripurna Brahman cannot be explained by religious concepts.

Paripurna Rajayoga's ultimate aim is to practise ***moksa-sannyasa-yoga*** or ***jnana-sannyasa-yoga***<sup>50</sup>. If one gets complete yogic view of Brahman, he is in a state of *moksa* (release from all limitations). But he will be there, again he may cause creation. So he has to renounce himself. That means the Brahman is *maya*. It is not existing at all. Only Paripurna Brahman is existing. So, to achieve the *moksa-sannyasa-yoga*, the *yoga margas* such as Karma, Bhakti, Jnana which were preached by three schools viz. Advaita, Visistadvaita, and Dvaita are not useful. Paripurna Rajayoga can only be practised by renouncing one self (*kartṛtva rahita karmacarana*). The state and result of that yoga is not describable.

## REFERENCES

1. Swami Gambhirananda (Trans). Bhagavad Gita, Second Edition, Advaita Ashrama, Calcutta, 1991. P. 275 - 276
2. ibid, P. 276 - 278
3. ibid, P. 278 - 279
4. ibid, P. 279 - 281
5. ibid, P. 283 - 284
6. ibid, P. 96 - 97
7. ibid, P. 300
8. ibid, P. 301
9. Swami Madhavananda (Trans), Viveka Cudamani, Fifteenth Impression, Advaita Ashrama, Calcutta, 1998, P. 87.
10. ibid, P. 174
11. ibid, P. 174
12. ibid, P. 39
13. ibid, P. 39
14. ibid, P. 39
15. ibid, P. 77

16. ibid, P. 146
17. ibid, P. 85
18. Swami Adidevananda (Trans), Sri Ramanuja Gita Bhasya, Sri Ramakrishna Math, P . 100 - 101
19. ibid, P. 211 - 212
20. Radhakrishnan S, Indian Philosophy, Vol-II, 8th impression, 1966, P. 678.
21. ibid, P. 693
22. ibid, P. 692
23. ibid, P. 687 - 688
24. ibid, P. 703
25. Animasen Guptha, A critical study of the Philosophy of Ramanuja, The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1967, P. 129.
26. Radhakrishnan S, Indian Philosophy, Vol-II, 8th impression, 1966, P. 704.
27. S. Subba Rau (Trans), Bhagavad Gita, Publications India, New Delhi, 1st edition, 1988, P. 55 - 56
28. ibid, P. 56 - 57



29. ibid, P. 57
30. ibid, P. 57 - 58
31. ibid, P. 58 - 59
32. B.N.K. Sharma, Sri Madhva's teachings in his own words, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Calcutta, 2nd edition, 1970, P. 114 - 115
33. ibid, P. 72 - 74
34. ibid, P. 149
35. B.N.K. Sharma, Philosophy of Sri Madhvacarya, Motilal Banarsidass, Revised edition, 1986, P. 405.
36. Dayananda ponnala Rajayogi, Asparsha Yogamu Ane Srimadbhagavadgita, Rajayogashramam, 1994, P. 30.
37. Bangore (editor), Vemana Padyalu, Tirumala Tirupati devastanamulu, 3rd ed, 1992, P. 26.
38. C.P. Brown, Verses of Vemana, Asian Educational Services, 4th Reprint, 1993, P. 28.

39. ibid, P. 33.
40. ibid, P. 26.
41. Bhagavata Krishna Desikulu, Sakala Vedanta Sara Granthokta, Rajayogashramam, 1990, P. 47.
42. Dayananda Ponnala Rajayogi, Paripurna Raja Vidya Rajaguhya Shikhamani, Rajayogashramam, 3rd ed, 1996, P. 50 - 51.
43. ibid, P. 36.
44. Achalarsi Dayananda Rajayogi (comm), Suddha Nirguna tatva Kandaritha Darvulu, Rajayogashramam, 5th ed, 1995, P. 76 - 77.
45. ibid, P. 79 - 80.
46. ibid, P. 88
47. Yilapakurthi Viravenkata Ramachandra Rao, Paripurna Darshanamu, 1st ed, 1965, P. 97 - 98.
48. Achalarsi Dayananda Rajayogi (comm), Suddha Nirguna tatva Kandaritha Darvulu, Rajayogashramam, 5th ed, 1995, P. 85.
49. ibid, P. 63.
50. ibid, P. 119.

## **CHAPTER - III**

### **A CRITICAL REVIEW OF MAIN SYSTEMS OF YOGA IN RELATION TO VEDANTA**

## CHAPTER - III

### A CRITICAL REVIEW OF MAIN SYSTEMS OF YOGA IN RELATION TO VEDANTA

Yoga is viewed and practised in different ways by the followers of different philosophical systems of India. Though all orthodox philosophical systems depend upon the Vedas and Upanisads, there are various ways in thinking and practising of Yoga in various philosophical systems. That means there is no clear co-ordination between these systems and the Vedas and Upanisads. Hence one can conclude that without understanding the essence of the Vedas and Upanisads, man created various religions which are contradicting to one another. Of these religious systems Advaita, Visistadvaita, and Dvaita are prominent.

Present research work is confined to four schools viz, Advaita, Visistadvaita, Dvaita, and Paripurna Rajayoga. Of these Paripurna Rajayoga may be a new school for you but it is as old as the Vedas and Upanisads. This system is not a religion or not a *matamu*<sup>1</sup>, but it is a *siddhanta* which is based on the Vedas, Upanisads, Brahma-Sutras, and Bhagavad Gita etc. Here the first three schools are to be critically examined with special reference to main systems of Yoga such as Karma-Yoga, Bhakti-Yoga, and Jnana-Yoga.

## MAIN SYSTEMS OF YOGA IN RELATION TO ADVAITA:

According to Sankara's Advaita the seeking after one's real nature is designated as Bhakti or devotion. That meant '*atmanusandhana*' or '*abheda drstī*' is called real Bhakti. According to *śrutis* '*sarvam khalvidam Brahma*', '*neha nanasti kincana*'; I am the Brahman, I am all i.e., everything is Brahman. So who is to be worshipped or serviced? Hence *sevaka-bhava* or *dasatva-bhava* is not real Bhakti because it leads to duality. So only seeking after one's real nature is designated as real Bhakti or devotion by which one can be liberated from *samsara*. Hence Bhakti holds supreme place among the things conducive to liberation<sup>2</sup>. This is all said by Sankara.

But intense love towards Lord or *Isvara* or *Viṣṇu* or demigods leads to duality. Hence it is not Bhakti in relation to Advaitic stand point and which leads to *samsara*. The meaning of the Bhakti is nothing but Jnana according to Sankara. Bhakti is '*abheda drstī*' i.e., Jnana. But there is no worshipping of any deity. Hence there is no meditation process. And therefore the *sādhaka* need not depend upon the grace of Lord as in the case of Viśiṣṭādvaita to get *mokṣa*. In Sankara's words: '*mokṣa is svasvarūpanusandhana*' i.e., seeking after one's real nature. It has to be done with knowledge (Jnana) only. Hence Sankara gave the top most priority for Jnana-Yoga. The other systems of Yoga such as Karma-Yoga, Bhakti-Yoga, and Rāja-Yoga were not preferred by Sankara.

Throughout his commentary on the Gita, Sankara denounces the possibility of effecting any synthesis between Karma and Jnana, all the

while defining the Karma in question, to himself, as *kamyakarma*. But he hardly ever envisages the possibility of a true synthesis between '*niskama karma* and *atma-jnana*'. Indeed, he seems to deny even the name *karma* to be given to the works performed by the enlightened soul as *Lokasangraha* or the work of Krishna himself as a *ksatriya* in upholding *dharma*. But the whole emphasis of Karma-Yoga of the Gita is on recognizing the need for giving a re-orientation to the concept of '*karma*' and redeeming it from the spell of rewards and fruits, and making it possible for blending such exalted form of Karma with Jnana. Sankara is hardly fair to the spirit of the Gita in denying the possibility of the synthesis of even such exalted form of '*niskama karma*' with '*atmajnana*', of which Krishna himself and persons like Janaka and Priyavrata were standing examples. However the view of the essential oneness behind phenomena, expressed fully and openly in the Upanisads and made popular by the Bhagavad Gita, was later philosophically elaborated by Sankara his Advaita Vedanta system of thought. He also gave practical instructions concerning Yoga techniques so that a review of Jnana-Yoga methodology can be attempted on the basis of Sankara's writings.

According to Sankara, there are four basic requirements<sup>3</sup> in Jnana-Yoga discipline in which the Yogi has to train himself:

1. **Viveka(discrimination):** The aspirant has to develop and cultivate the ability to recognize what is impermanent, temporary, and fleeting in life as he experiences it, and what is of lasting value and pointing to the eternal. He has to try to discriminate between the superficial and the essential, between the illusory reality on the surface and the absolute reality in the inner, deep dimension of existence. In this way he has to

try to scrutinise, analyse, and evaluate constantly his experiences, inclinations, decisions, and actions.

2. **Vairagya (dispassionateness)**: The Yogi has to guard his mind against becoming possessed, infatuated or, later, even slightly disturbed by passions springing from sensual desires; or from attachment to things that bring sensual satisfaction. *Raga* means originally 'colouring', which indicates that passions are, in fact, obstructions of the mind that do not allow clear vision. To achieve the clarity of mind that is essential for final knowledge and wisdom, attachments, and passions that 'colour' it is so that it sees distortedly must be got rid of.

3. **Satsampatti (Six attainments)**: This instruction contains a programme of self-education for success on the Yoga path covering six points:

- (1) *Sama* or the cultivation of tranquillity of the mind
- (2) *Dama* or self-control in acting
- (3) *Uparati* or eradicating the eagerness to possess.
- (4) *Titiksha* or patience
- (5) *Sraddha* or confidence, also meaning sincerity
- (6) *Samadhana* or intentness of the mind.

4. **Mumuksatva (longing for liberation)**: This last requirement is very important. The aspirant must develop a positive longing (not to say a passion) for liberation. Its development is supported by the previous endeavours as described above, especially by the advanced ability to discriminate between the unsatisfactory superficial reality and the safety-

promising, spiritual dimension of higher experience.

The Jnana-Yoga of the Advaita religious tradition proceeds, generally speaking, through three stages:

1. **Sravana:** This means "hearing". The *sadhaka* has first to go through a period of extensive and intensive study which has to be done by listening to the teachings his spiritual master (Guru). The essence of teachings of master is "*tatvamasi Brahma*". [Thou art you]. This is *upadesa vakya* or '*sravana vakya*' of spiritual master. All types of teachings teach this sentence (*upadesa vakya*) only. The disciple has to listen to his *guru* carefully. This process is known as '*sravana*'. This should give the mind of the aspirant the right direction, outlook, and material for the next stage '*manana*'.

2. **Manana:** '*Manana*' is the process of repetition of the essence of teachings of his *guru*. It is nothing but repetition of the outcome of '*Sravana*' in the mind of '*sadhaka*'. It is to be done by the *vakya* (sentence): "*aham Brahmasmi*" [*sisya vakya*] or '*manana vakya*'. Constant practise of '*manana*' leads to *Nidhidhyasa*.

3. **Nidhidhyasa:** This state is known as "*Prajananam Brahma*" which is called '*nidhidhyasa vakya*'. This expression can be translated as 'bank of concentration'. This stage of training makes it clear to the aspirant that the process of opening of a new channel to reality over and above the senses and the intellect is not a matter of mental exercises during meditational sessions only, but that it is also and equally necessary to introduce a kind of meditational attitude into one's life so that eventually



the mind is in a state of meditation even when dealing with the business of everyday living. As this capacity is developed and deepened, the Yogi's intuition and spiritual vision grow until he reaches the final vision of truth, which brings him the final achievement of liberation (*moksa*).

After *Nidhidhyasana*, the *Sadhaka* gets direct vision of Brahman. This is said by another *maha vakya* "*ayamatma Brahma*". These four *vakya*s were taken from the four Vedas. The last state is called *Advaita siddhi* or the characteristic of *jivanmukta*.

But this system of *sravana*, *manana*, *nidhidhyasa* is quite dependent on *sruti*: '*Atmavare drastavya, srotavyo, mantavyo, nidhidhyasitavyah*'<sup>4</sup> (Brhadaranyakopanisad). But this system cannot give direct vision of Brahman (Absolute Brahman).

Because that Brahman:

'*nainamatma pravacana satenapi labhyate nabahu srutena, na buddhi Jnanena na srutena*'<sup>5</sup> [Atman is known neither by hundred spiritual sentences nor by *srutis*, nor by ears, nor by *buddhi*, nor by Jnana].

'*na tatra caksurgaccati, na vaggaccati, no mano..*'<sup>6</sup> (Kenopanisad)

[The eye does not go there, nor speech, nor mind. We do not know (Brahman to be such and such); hence we are not aware of any process of instructing about It]

"*yanmanasa na manute yena hurmano matam tadeva Brahmatvam viddhi nedam yadidamupasate*"<sup>7</sup> [That which man does not comprehend with the mind, that by which, they say, the mind is encompassed, know that to be Brahman and not what people worship as an object].

Hence there should not be any sentences which will tell directly about Brahman. That's why it is said that it is meaning of *sruti*. Hence *sravana* is not possible about that Brahman. If there are no sentences about It, how is the *manana* possible? It is beyond mind, so it cannot be meditated (*manana*). If Brahman is not possible for *sravana* and *manana*, that is not possible for *nidhidhyasa* also. All four *mahavakyas* are meant that Jiva is Brahman. Therefore the Brahman will not be an object for Jiva to get direct realisation through the system of *sravana*, *manana*, *nidhidhyasa*. So the system is becoming not useful to get liberation.

Hence the Jnana-Yoga of Advaita Vedanta is incomplete. Moreover there is an *adhyaropa-apavada* or *vivarta apavada* in this system. It is to be critically reviewed in relation to the Vedas, Upanisads, Brahma-Sutras, and Bhagavad Gita, then only the analysis of Jnana-Yoga of Advaita will be complete.

Brahman, according to Sankara, is attribute less, immutable, pure Intelligence. *Isvara*, according to him, is a product of *maya* the highest reading of the *Nirguna* Brahman by the individualized soul. The world is a *vivarta* or apparent transformation through *maya* of the *Nirguna* Brahman but not in reality. The Jiva in reality is all-pervading and identical with Brahman, though as individualized by its *Upadhi* (adjunct),

the internal organ, it regards itself as atomic as an agent, and as a part of the Lord. The knowers of the *Nirguna* Brahman attain It directly and have not to go by 'the path of the gods'. It is the knowers of the *Saguna* Brahman that go by that path to *Brahmaloka* from where they do not return but attain Brahman at the end of the cycle. Knowledge is the only means to liberation. But if the characteristics of Brahman are enquired or if the origin of the world is enquired, it will be known that whether Sankara's *maya-vada* is true or false. Hence a review of origin of the world can be attempted on the basis of the Vedas, Upanisads, Brahma-Sutras, and Bhagavad Gita.

From Rg-Veda, Vajasaneya Samhita (33-74):- *Jijnasi* is asking: '*Kimsidvanam Ka usa vrksamasit Yato dyava Prthvi nista taksuhu*' (That means from which forest and from which tree's wood, the *divi* and *bhuvi* i.e., the whole world is made of?). The question is: "what is the material which caused the world ?". This is a very old question. The answer for this is:

*'Brahma vanam Brahma Sa vrksa asit  
Yatodyava Prthvi nista taksuhu  
Manisino manasa vibravimivo  
Brahmadhya tistan bhuvanani dharayan'*

That means Brahman is that forest and a tree in that forest is also Brahman. From that tree's wood, this *divi* and *buvi* i.e., the whole is made of. And the same Brahman is dressing and sustaining all the worlds or *bhuvanas*. Hence one can conclude that the Brahman is (*nimitta* and *upadana karanas*) the material and efficient cause according to *sruti*.

From Upanisads:- From Kathopanisd, second chapter, *tritiyavalli* first *mantra*,

*'Urdhvamulo avak sakha esosvatha sanatanah  
tadesa sukram tadbrahma tadevamrta mucyate  
tasminnu lokassritassarve  
tadunatyeti kascana etatdvaitat'*

"This is the beginningless peelpul tree that has its roots above and branches down. That ( which is its root) is pure, that is Brahman and that is called immortal. On that are fixed all the worlds; none transcends that. This is verify that"<sup>8</sup>. Hence the *srsti* or creation of peelpul tree is made of Brahman.

From Kathopanisd, ii, iii. 2, 2nd *mantra*,

*'yadidam kimca jagatsarvam, prana yejati nisrtam'*

"That means all this universe that there is, emerges and moves out from this Brahman"<sup>9</sup>.

From Mundakopanisd; first *mundaka*, 2nd *mantra*  
*'yattadadresya magrahya magotra mavarna  
macaksu ssrotra tadapani padam  
nityam vibhum sarva gatam susuksmam  
tadavyayam yatbhutayonim paripasyanti dhirah'*

"By the higher knowledge the wise realize everywhere that which cannot be perceived and grasped, which is without source, features, eyes, and ears, which has neither hands nor feet, which is eternal multifarious, all pervasive, extremely subtle, and undiminishing and which is the source of all"<sup>10</sup>. Here which is *bhutayoni*? I.e., which is the source of all? Is it either Brahman or Pradhana ?

This doubt was cleared by Vyasa (Badarayana) in his Brahma - Sutras.

From Brahma-Sutras: Chapter 1, Section 2, Sutras 21:

*'adrsyatvadi gunako dharmokteh'*

"The possessor of qualities like invisibility etc., is Brahman on account of its characteristics being mentioned.

"(For this *sutra*, the Sankara's commentary is) "that which cannot be seen or seized, which is without origin.....eternal, all pervading, omnipresent, extremely subtle....., the source of all beings, which the wise behold "(Mu 1.1.6)6. The Being which is the source of all beings is not the *pradhana* but Brahman, for all qualities like "He is all knowing, all perceiving" (Mu. 1.1.9) are true only of Brahman and not of the *pradhana*, which is non-intelligent. Obviously it cannot refer to the individual soul as it is limited"<sup>11</sup>.

From this one can state that the *bhutayoni* or the source of all is Brahman. And from the same Brahma-Sutras chapter 2, section 1, Sutra 37:

*"Sarvadharmopapathesca"*

"And because all attributes required for the creation of the world are possible only in the Brahman, It is the cause of the world. So that Badarayana also confirms that the Brahman is real cause of the world"<sup>12</sup>.

From Taittiriya Upanisad, 1st chapter, Prathamonuvakah:

*'Om Brahma vidapnoti param tadesabhyukta  
satyam Jnanamanantam Brahma  
Yo veda nihitam guhayam parame vyoman  
So snute sarvan kaman saha brahmana vipasciteti'*

*'tasmadva etasmadatmana akasa sambhuta  
akasadvayuh, vayoragnihi agnerapah  
adbhyah prthvi prthivya osadhayah  
osadhibhyo annam annatpurusah'*

"From that Brahman was produced space. From space emerged air. From air was born fire. From fire was created water. From water sprang up earth. From the earth were born the herbs. From the herbs was produced food. From food was born man"<sup>13</sup>.

From Candogya Upanisad: *'Sarvam khalvidam Brahma tajjalaniti santa upasita'* i.e., the whole world is Brahman. Because it has been said that *'tajjalaniti'*.

It means : "(1) *tajjatvat* = The world has been created from Brahman, (2) *tallatvat* = The world has been dissolved in Brahman, (3) *tannistatvat* = The world has been sustained in Brahman. Hence the whole world is said to be Brahman by Candogya Upanisad"<sup>14</sup>.

From Brahma-Sutras (BS) :

1) '*janmadyasya yatah*' (1-1-2, BS) [i.e. origin etc. (i.e., sustenance and dissolution) of this (world) from which] "which means Brahman is that omniscient, omnipotent cause from which proceed the origin etc. (i.e., sustenance and dissolution) of this (world)"<sup>15</sup>.

2) '*dvubhyayatanam svasabda*' (1-3-1, BS) i.e., "The resting-place of heaven, earth etc.(is Brahman) on account of the word self (or on account of the actual words of the *sruti*)"<sup>16</sup>.

3) '*jagadvacitva*' (1-4-16, BS) i.e., "He of whom all this is the work is Brahman because the work denotes the world"<sup>17</sup>.

4) '*adrsyatvadi gunako dharmokte*' (1-4-16, BS) i.e., "The possessor of qualities like invisibility etc. (is Brahman) on account of (its) characteristics being mentioned"<sup>18</sup>.

5) '*atmakrte parinama*' (1-4-26, BS) i.e., "Brahman is the material cause of the world because the *Sruti* says that it created It self by undergoing modification"<sup>19</sup>.

6) '*yoniscahigiyate*' (1-4-27,BS) i.e., "And because (Brahman) is called the origin"<sup>20</sup>.

7) '*Upasamharadarsananneticenna ksiravrdh*' (2-1-25,BS) i.e., " If it be said (that Brahman without extraneous aids) cannot (be the cause of the world) because (an agent) is seen to collect materials (for any construction), (we say) no, since (it is) like milk (turning into curds)"<sup>21</sup>.

8) '*devadivadapiloke*' (2-1-25,BS) i.e., "( the case of Brahman creating the world is) even like the gods and other beings in the world"<sup>22</sup>.

From above first and second Brahma-Sutras, it is known that Brahman is the basis of this whole world. And from third and fourth sutras, it is also known that Brahman is the *karta and karayita*. And from fifth and sixth sutras, Brahman is material cause of this world. From last two sutras it is clear that Brahman is cause of *Parinama*.

From Bhagavad Gita (BG) :

In relation to Bhagavad Gita also, it can be proved that Brahman is the both efficient and material cause for the world. For this reference a few *slokas* are given below from Bhagavad Gita:

1. '*bijam mam sarvabhutanam.....*' (7-10, BG) i.e., "O Partha, know Me to be the eternal seed of all beings. I am the intellect of the intelligent, I am the courage of the courageous"<sup>23</sup>.
2. '*Prakrtim svamavastabhya visrjami punah punah...*' (9-8, BG) i.e., "Keeping My own *Prakrti* under control, I project forth again and



again the whole of this multitude of beings which are powerless owing to the influence of (their own) nature"<sup>24</sup>.

3. '*mayadhyaksena prakrtissuyate sacaracaram....*' (9-10, BG)  
"Under Me as the supervisor, the *prakrti* produces ( the world ) of the moving and the non moving things. Owing to this reason, O son of Kunti, the world revolves"<sup>25</sup>.
4. '*gatirbhartā prabhusaksi nivasassaranam suhrt prabhavah pralayasthanam nidhanam bijamavyayam*' (9-18, BG) i.e., " (I am) the fruit of actions, the nourisher, the Lord, witness, abode, refuge, friend, origin, end, foundation, store and the imperishable seed"<sup>26</sup>.
5. '*yaccapi sarvabhutanam bijam tadahamarjuna na tadasti vina yatsyanmaya bhutan caracaram*' (10-39, BG) i.e., "Moreover, O Arjuna, whatsoever is the seed of all beings, that I am. There is nothing moving or non-moving which can exist without Me"<sup>27</sup>.
6. '*mama yonirmahadbrahma tasmingarbhā dadhamyāham sambhavah sarva bhutanam tato bhavati bharata*' (14-3, BG) i.e., "My womb is the great-sustainer. In that I place the seed. From that, O scion of the Bharata dynasty, occurs the birth of all things"<sup>28</sup>.
7. '*sarva yonisu kounteya murtayah sambhavantiyah tasam brahma mahadyoni raham bija pradah pita*' (14-4, BG) i.e., "O son of kunti, whatever forms are born from all the wombs, of them

the great sustainer is the womb; I am the father who deposits the seed"<sup>29</sup>.

8. '*mamaivamso jivaloke jivabhutah sanatanah manahsastanindriyani praktisthani karsati*' (15-7, BG) i.e., "It is verily a part of Mine which, becoming the eternal individual soul in the region of living being, draws (to itself) the organs which have the mind as their sixth, and which abide in Nature"<sup>30</sup>.
9. '*ajopi sannavyayatma bhutanamisvaropi san prakrtim svamadhistaya sambhavamyatma mayaya*' (4-6, BG) i.e., "Though I am birthless, undecaying by nature, and the Lord of beings, (still) by subjugating My *Prakrti*, I take birth by means of my own *Maya*"<sup>31</sup>.

Hence from above *slokas* it is clear that Brahman is cause of the world. It is already proved that the Vedas, Upanisads, Brahma-Sutras are preaching that Brahman is the origin, cause and effect of the world.

Hence *jagat* (world) is not *mithya*, but it is as true as, Brahman. And this contradicts with theory of Sankara of '*Brahma satyam jaganmithya jivo Brahmaiva na parah*'. And there by no arise of superimposition theory or *adhyaropa vada*. In this situation the *adhyaropa vada* or *vivarta vada* is an error because *jagat* is not *mithya*, but it is as true as Brahman.

In Vivekacudamani Sankara said "neither by yoga nor by Samkhya,

nor by work (karma), nor by learning, but by the realization of one's identity with Brahman is liberation possible, and by no other means"<sup>32</sup>. And in Tatvabodha, Sankara said '*Brahmaivaham asmi iti aparoksajnanena nikhila karma bandha nirmuktah syat*'. Hence according to Advaita, only Karma-Yoga does not lead to liberation as said by Sankara. And Bhakti-Yoga i.e., worshipping of any God or Lord leads to plurality so that it will not be Advaita. That is why Bhakti-Yoga is also not leading to liberation. But only Jnana-Yoga can lead to liberation from *samsara* according to Sankara. But that is also not possible because the Brahman is the real cause of the world and even if one knows one's real nature by *svasvarupanusandhana* (Jnana-Yoga), one will not be out of this creation of Brahman. Even if one does not get or if one gets realization of Brahman, he will be in the cycle of birth and death because the Brahman and the world are the two sides of the same coin i.e., they are one and same. Hence it is said '*Brahmana saha muktih*'<sup>33</sup> i.e., liberation with Brahman only or one will get liberation when Brahman gets liberation. Hence Jnana-Yoga of Advaita is not useful to get liberation from *samsara*

More over Sankara said that *karmopasanas* or the other *sadhanas* were not aimed at *moksa* as direct *sadhanas*. But Jnana only is the direct *sadhana*, because he said "*pratyagbrahma vicara purvamubhayoreketva bodharvina, Kaivalyam purusasya sidhyati parabrahmatmatalaksanam na snanairapi kirtanairapi japairno krchra chandrayanairno vasya dhvara krtya danamigamairno mantra tantrairapi*" and "*Jnanadevatu kaivalyamiti srutyani gadyate Jnanasya hetutvamanya vyavrtti purvakam*"<sup>34</sup>.

Hence it can be concluded that Sankara aimed at only Jnana-Yoga, but that Jnana-Yoga is also not enough to get liberation as it is discussed earlier.

## **MAIN SYSTEMS OF YOGA IN RELATION TO VISISTADVAITA :**

In Visistadvaita, the most priority was given for Bhakti-Yoga. Bhakti-Yoga of Visistadvaita constitutes Karma-Yoga and Jnana-Yoga as its helping components. Initially the Bhakti-Yoga of Visistadvaita is to be reviewed and then it is to be critically analysed in relation to other yoga systems and its role and place is to be determined.

"According to Ramanujacarya, *bhakti* has been described as a knowledge which consists in excessive adoration and attachment to the ultimate reality as a result of which the devotee becomes absolutely disinterested in all other objects of the world. It is further said that God is the highest being and as such He naturally becomes the dearest treasure of a human heart. Meditation on God or a full knowledge of the nature of God generates love and transform *dhyana* itself into a form of love and affection"<sup>35</sup>. Bhakti, according to Ramanuja, is not merely an emotion of love and respect devoid of knowledge that fills the heart of an individual with a deep feeling of attachment for the Supreme Divinity. He thus equalled Bhakti with *dhyana* and *upasana*, emphasising thereby the importance of the rational aspect in it. It has been stated in the *Sribhasya* that Bhakti is a form of loving meditation on the nature of God. Here too, Ramanuja has stated that *dhyana* which is identical with Bhakti is also synonymous with *upasana* and *vedana*. *Upasana* means

concentration of mind wholly on God, as described by the Upanisads and no other thought should disturb the mind during *upasana* or *dhyana*<sup>36</sup>. From this it is clear that devotee's mind always obsessed with the pleasant thoughts of God and God is the most beloved object of devotee. This is Bhakti.

From above discussion it is inferred that Ramanuja has recognised a very close connection between Bhakti and Jnana or devotion and knowledge. According to Ramanuja, knowledge is very foundation of Bhakti and it is Jnana that produces Bhakti and also enriches it. Bhakti consists knowledge, intense affection and self-surrender to the Highest Being who is the Lord and Protector of the whole Universe and such a surrender takes place only when the individual self realizes his own nature, the nature of God and also the nature of his relation to Supreme Reality.

Love could not spring forth in the heart of a devotee unless he knows the nature of the object which he loves. So the knowledge is necessary for the emergence of Bhakti in the heart of a devotee.

To develop devotion in the heart of a devotee, not only Jnana - Yoga but also Karma - Yoga is necessary. It is the disinterested performance of *nitya-naimittika-karmas* (daily duties and duties obligatory on occasions) that purifies the mind of an individual and makes him fit for grasping the ultimate truth.

In the view of Ramanuja, Karma - Yoga is an auxiliary to his Bhakti-Yoga. And Karma is such a thing that should not be given up at any

stage of life. The importance of disinterested knowledge and self-realization has been emphasized by Ramanuja in his commentary on the Gita, chapter 3, sloka 1, "*jñananistha eva atmavalokana sadhanam, karmanistha tu tasyah nispadika*". In his view knowledge is indeed an important part of disinterested action and as such both are complementary to each other.

The most important requirement for the performance of disinterested action is the complete dissociation of the soul from the ego-consciousness or *ahamkara* which is a product of *Prakrti*. It is because of the identification of an individual's self with the ego-consciousness that he thinks of himself as the doer of actions and enjoyer of all sorts of wordly experiences. One is able to practise Karma-Yoga by dissociating his self wholly from the egocentric desires, and this happens to him only when the light of self-knowledge, illuminates and purifies his heart i.e., when he feels and realizes that the soul is essentially different from the body-mind system. The disinterested action has been described as action illumined by the light self-knowledge: '*Evamantargata jnanam yat karmatatte prabaksyami yat jnatva Anusthaya asubhat samsara bandhat moksyase.....*'<sup>67</sup>.

Therefore knowledge is not separate from bhakti and karma; on other hand, it is an important ingredient of both devotion and disinterested action.

In the first stage, knowledge is needed to purify all actions of the devotee. In this stage devotee realizes that his soul is different from the body and the sense-organs which are the vehicles of action and that

his sole purpose of life is to please God. He understands that *Prakṛti* is not his substratum and that the bodily self associated with all the organs is an object to be shunned. This true knowledge of the soul helps him to give up the sense of agency of all wordly activities and also to make his mind completely free from the desire to enjoy the fruits of such actions. Devotion, in this stage, is called *Sadhana bhakti* or *Upaya bhakti*.

In the second stage, the true knowledge of self and also the knowledge of its non-relation to *Prakṛti* as the substratum ripens into a firm faith in God as the individual's role source and support: his mind is now illumined with the light of the knowledge of this true relation to God. Here, all Philosophical interpretations of the relation such as "*Sarira-sarira bhava*" (body-soul feeling), "*Prakara-Prakari Bhava*" (mode-substance feeling), "*Sesa-Sesi Bhava*" (Principal-accessory feeling), etc. are directly experienced by him and naturally, therefore, this knowledge of *Amsa-Amsi* generates in his mind a deep devotion and love for God as He is now looked upon as the individual's only refuge. In this stage, knowledge becomes the cause of bhakti. Devotion, in this stage, is called *Parabhakti*.

In the last stage (*Parama bhakti*) when knowledge deepens into highest form of bhakti, it assumes the form of constant meditation, thinking and reflection on the *svarupa* of God. Thus when a man attains full knowledge of his absolute dependence on God, he at once shifts his attention from wordly objects to God, gives up his egoism totally, performs action with complete detachment and meditates constantly on the nature of God. An important question may be asked here, what form of God is

constantly contemplated upon by the devotee in this stage of *Parama bhakti* ?

"Regarding this point, it is very difficult to make any clear and definite suggestion: still by following the philosophical trend of Ramanuja, we may say that the devotee visualises God first of all, as one possessing infinite auspicious qualities, devoid of all faults, blissful and merciful and by repeated meditation on God, the devotee gradually loses all sense of difference. There remain neither the feeling of '*Grahita*' nor the feeling of '*Grahana*'. The devotee becomes fully immersed in the '*Grahya-rupa*'. Different qualities of God get merged into His one form; and though qualities are present, yet there is no feeling of any distinction between the substance and its attributes. All differences are totally lost in this state. This is the last and final state of Bhakti-Yoga when the worshipper feels no difference between himself and God, acquires all the fundamental characteristics of his Ideal and finally realises Him as his own self. The non-dualistic consciousness of the liberated soul is expressed in the feeling "I am Brahman without any division". This non-duality however does not mean *svarupa aikya* but *Visista aikya* in which the self is realised as an inseparable mode of God who is its only support and substratum. By the acquisition of equality of attributes with God the individual soul also becomes as pure as Brahman (*Brahmasamana suddhi*)"<sup>38</sup>.

Psychologically this stage can be considered as a stage of Advaita. Bhakti (devotion) in this stage is *Upaya Bhakti* and there exists an experienced unity between the devotee and God. Difference exists only ontologically as the self is naturally different from God.



The seven-fold *sadhanas*<sup>39</sup> leading to Bhakti are enumerated by Ramanuja as follows:

1. **Viveka**:- Viveka means purification of body by taking only *sattvika* food.
2. **Vimoka**:- freedom from passion and anger as these two are great obstacles in the path of bhakti.
3. **Abhyasa**:- Continuous remembrance of the presence of God as the in-dwelling principle with a pure body and a purified mind.
4. **Kriya**:- The *mumuksu* has got to perform five-fold duties according to his ability.
5. **Kalyana**:- refers to virtue or inner-side of duty. It consists of *satya* or truth, *arjaba* or purity of thought, word and action, *daya* or kindness, *dana* and *ahimsa*.
6. **Anavasada**:- means freedom from all sorts of despair, dejection etc.
7. **Anudharsa**:- is the absence of too much excitation on account of pleasure and too much depression on account of pain.

"The seven-fold *sadhanas* of bhakti lead to the of experience (*anubhava*) which is just prior to the final realisation of Brahman and which possesses, fullness, vividness, and liveliness of perception. When such a vivid experience of God takes place, naturally the heart of devotee becomes full to the brim with intense love, respect, and yearning for that supremely beloved object. This is *Parabhakti* (Primary love of God) which blossoms into *Paramabhakti* when the devotee succeeds in winning the grace of God. When the God responds to devotee's call, devotee forgets everything, gives up all *dharma*s and seeks refuge in

the loving heart of his beloved God"<sup>40</sup>.

In the stage of *Paramabhakti* the devotee places his heart in the heart of God and dedicates all his actions to God. *Paramabhakti* is the finest flower of devotion and in essence seems to be identical with *Prapatti* - a path prescribed for those persons who are incapable of going through the different stages of Bhakti-Yoga.

*Prapatti* literally means seeking the protection of God after realising that He is the only Saviour of this sorrow-stricken world. A complete surrender of individuality and egoistic impulses is called *Prapatti*, and this when effected, eliminates all sense of difference.

"There is no difference between *Prapatti* and *Paramabhakti* which is the highest culmination of the path of Bhakti-Yoga is a synthetic process with itself both Jnana-Yoga and Karma-Yoga, *Prapatti* or *Saranagati* is a simple and direct approach to God through self-surrender, love, and humility. The absolute self-surrendering attitude, dedication of everything to God, complete elimination of ego-sense and supreme love for God are present in both the forms; but while as a method, Bhakti-Yoga is a long and laborious process, *Prapatti* method is simple in the sense that here devotee is not in need of any external '*sadhana*' to purify his outer organs. A single moment of serious and sincere offering of oneself to God is considered enough; and it is immediate and non-laborious, it is regarded as superior to Bhakti-Yoga"<sup>41</sup>.

"In his commentary on Bhagavad Gita, Ramanuja has stated explicitly that *Prapatti* is actually the final culmination of the method of

Bhakti-Yoga and it will not be complete unless its results in pious resignation. In *Yatindramatadipika*, *Prapatti* has been described as a form of knowledge and thus, it is not in essence different from *Paramābhakti* which the devotee attains by following *Bhakti-marga*. This *Prapatti* or *Paramabhakti* is 'immortal bliss' (*amṛtasvarūpa*) which the devotee acquires by the grace of God and by sacrificing his ego. Both *Prapatti* and *Paramabhakti* result in the emergence of an attitude which makes one feel and act as if his personality does not exist"<sup>42</sup>.

Hence it can be stated that both Bhakti-Yoga and Prapatti-Yoga are regarded by Ramanuja as commendable methods for the attainment of *mukti*. Both of them are identical and so far as essential ingredients are concerned. With a view to keeping harmony with the traditional religion of age; "Ramanuja opened the path of Bhakti-Yoga to the three higher castes. The lower casts, who were debarred from *Vaidika Jnana* and *Vaidika Karma*, could not adopt the path of Bhakti-Yoga. So the path of *Prapatti* was introduced for all low caste people so as to enable them to adopt *Vaiṣṇava* customs and manners without in any way violating the principles of the Brahmanic religion. The goal is the same, the essential ingredients are identical; but while Bhakti-Yoga is an approach through philosophical knowledge, action, love, and respect, *Prapatti* is an approach to God through faith and selfless love accompanied by an attitude of self-surrender and resignation"<sup>43</sup>.

This is the Bhakti-Yoga of Ramanuja. This Bhakti -Yoga comprises Jnana - Yoga and Karma - Yoga within itself. But this Bhakti -Yoga is incomplete and dependent in relation to Paripurna Rajayoga. Hence it is to be critically reviewed in relation to Paripurna Rajayoga.

According to Visistadvaita Brahman is *Sagunasakara swarupa*. Brahman is infinite potentiality, knowledge, and truth. Energy is a quality of Brahman. Hence Brahman is not indeterminate, but determinate. In this concept: Brahman (*Isvara*), *jiva*, and *Prakrti* are true. In the gross state, Brahman becomes a plurality and in the subtle, it is a unity. The world is the transformation of the Brahman. This transformation or *parinama* does not affect the nature of Brahman, because it is its body that undergoes the change, while as the soul of the body, the Brahman remains unchanged.

Ramanuja did not accept the concept of *maya* of Sankara. The world is not a mere fallacy of the Brahman. It is as true as the Brahman. The difference between *jiva* and the Brahman is not merely due to *upādhi* or *maya*, but a real difference. The body of the Brahman which comprises both *jivas* and the inorganic world is eternal. Through the Bhakti alone one can reach God Visnu that is '*dehavimukti*'. But there is no *jivanmukti* in this religion. Hence there is only '*videhamukti*' which can be obtained by only Bhakti -Yoga.

Bhakti according to Visistadvaita: There are nine types of Bhakti that are to be practised one by one in Visistadvaita 1) listen the name of Visnu, 2) sing his songs, 3) remember his name, 4) do his feet service, 5) do his *poojas*, 6) do *vandanam* to him, 7) behave like a slave to him, 8) be friendly to him, 9) finally do *Atma nivedanam* to him. Then Visnu will take the devotee to his *loka* or world. There devotee will enjoy a lot and will not come back.

This state is *dehavimukti*. This is the Bhakti according to

Visistadvaita. In this Bhakti again there are three parts. (1) Bhakta or devotee renounces himself to Lord Visnu. This is *svarupa samarpana*. 2) All fruits of actions of Bhakta are to be given to Visnu. This is *pala samarpana*, 3) Bhakta keeps the responsibility on Visnu to give him liberation. This is *bhara samarpana*<sup>44</sup>. This is all only theory of Ramanujacarya in regard of Bhakti.

This type of Bhakti is not independent. Because Bhakta has to depend on Visnu to give him liberation. Bhakta has to wait for the mercy of Visnu. Moreover Bhakta does not know where Visnu is and where his *loka* is. And without looking at Visnu, the devotee could not develop intense love towards him.

According to Gita, one should raise oneself through self, and never lower oneself; for the self alone is one's friend and the self alone is one's enemy<sup>45</sup>. Hence no other person or God or Visnu cannot give liberation. It has to be enquired and attained by Bhakta himself with the help of a master or *Guru*.

Moreover, in Gita Krishna says "there is no difference between Me and *Jnani*"<sup>46</sup>.

According to Krishna :

There are four kinds of devotees to him. They are 1) the distressed person, ex:- Draupadi 2) The aspirant after knowledge 3) The seeker of wealth ex: Dhruva and (4) the man of knowledge (*jnani*).

In Gita, Krishna said that "of them, the man of knowledge (*jnani*) who is constantly in communion and single minded in devotion excels. To the man of knowledge I am very dear indeed, and he is dear to me. All of them are indeed noble, but man of realization I regard as my very self; for with his mind fixed, he has taken refuge in Me alone as the highest goal".

Hence here the important point is that Krishna says in Gita so many times 'I' and 'I'. What is meant by 'I'? Whether is it a person or something else? 'I' mean not a personal Krishna ? 'I' mean '*aham*'. That is nothing but Atman. To *jnani* everything is Atman according to *sruti* '*mamatma sarva bhutatma*'. Therefore there is no real difference between *jnani* and Krishna that means both are Atman.

Hence this *jnani* who realize no difference among all the living and non-living materials does not depend on anyone to help him out from *samsara*. This is quite contradictory to Ramanujacarya in regard of *sevyā-sevaka bhava*. Moreover only *jnani* is not selfish and independent whereas remaining three devotees are selfish and dependent on others. They are in need of somebody's help in their troubles and after that they do not even remember the name of the helper. Hence the most priority was given for *jnani* by Krishna.

However even if the Bhakta reaches *loka* of Vishnu; whenever Visnu comes to the earth as an *avatara* or as an incarnation, the Bhakta has to come down along with him as his attendant.

According to Kenopanisad, '*tadeva Brahmatvam viddhi nedam*

*yadidamupasate'* : that Brahman cannot be worshipped. It is contradicting with the Bhakti-Yoga of Visistadvaita. So whatever is being worshipped by Visistadvaitins is not Brahman. It can be stated that Brahman is not indicated by Visistadvaita.

*'Na tatra caksurgaccati na vaggaccati no manah na vidmo na vijanimo yathaitadanusisyat anyadeva tadviditadatho avidita dadhi iti susruma purvesham ye na satdvyaca caksire'* (Kenopanisad)

The eye does not go there, nor speech, nor mind, we do not know (Brahman to be such and such); hence we are not aware of any process of instructing about it. That (Brahman) is surely different from the known; and again; It is above the unknown such was (the utterance) we heard of the ancient (teachers) who explained It to us.

So from this one can easily conclude that the Brahman of Visistadvaita is not same as the Brahman which is described above as it was said in Kenopanisad.

The Brahman which was explained by Ramanuja is nothing but Yeruka of Paripurna Rajayoga. Yeruka is the cause and effect of this world. But the Brahman which was discussed above from Kenopanisad is Paripurna Brahman of Paripurna Rajayoga. This Paripurna Brahman is completely different from Brahman of Ramanuja. Ramanuja's Brahman satisfies the following *srutis*:

*'Bhumanamityupasya',*

*'Atmanamityupasya',*

'Omityupasya',  
'tajjalaniti santa upasita',  
'Atmavare drastavya srotavyah'.

But this Brahman which is explained in above *srutis* is the cause and effect of the universe. It is already discussed earlier in this chapter. Hence until and unless one overcomes from this Brahman he will not be released from the bondage of *samsara*.

Hence it is concluded that Bhakti-Yoga of Visistadvaita was incomplete and it does not give clear and independent path to liberation from *samsara*.

#### **MAIN SYSTEMS OF YOGA IN RELATION TO DVAITA:**

In Dvaita also, the most priority was given for Bhakti-Yoga by Madhavacarya. Initially the Bhakti-Yoga of Dvaita is to be reviewed and then it is to be critically reviewed in relation to the other yoga systems and its role and place is to be determined.

The most prominent forms of spiritual discipline are those going by the names of Karma-Yoga, Jnana-Yoga, and Bhakti-Yoga. Of these, Karma-Yoga is generally believed to constitute the first rung of the ladder. The term Karma-Yoga is, however, understood in most schools of Vedanta in the narrow sense of *Pravrtti-Marga*, as defined by the *Mimamsakas*, consisting in a faithful performance of the round of Vedic sacrifices and ritualistic rites prescribed by the *Srutis* and *smrtis* with the expectation of their rewards in this or in the next world and the



adherence to the duties of *Varna* and *Asrama*.

Sankara hardly ever envisages the possibility of a true synthesis between "*Niskama Karma* and *atma-jnana*". But Madhva's point in not accepting *Jnana-Karma-Samuccaya* is not due to any under-estimation of *Niskama-Karma* as such ; but to the unique place which *Aparoksa-Jnana* or direct vision of God occupies in his philosophy. The context is different with Ramanuja to whom *Dhyana* marks the highest stage of *Sadhana* which is but a mere approximate to direct vision; but is not actually a direct vision of the Lord. It is obviously for this reason that Ramanuja pleads for a *Samuccaya* of Jnana and Karma as *Moksa sadhana*. Among the other Vedantins Bhaskara, and Brahmadata too are known to have supported the *Jnana-Karma-Samuccaya*.

"Madhva tried to resolve this apparent conflict between the so called Karma-Yoga and Jnana-Yoga by enlarging the scope of Karma-Yoga as understood by Sankara and raising it to the level of a way of enlightened action (*niskamam jnanapurvam Karma*). He makes a vigorous plea for enlightened spiritual activity by all which cannot be binding in its consequences. There can be no true wisdom without such activity, at least for all of us, mortals, and no true Karma without enlightenment and devotion to God: '*yajnartat Karmanonyatra lokoyam Karma bandhanah*' (Gita-iii-9)"<sup>47</sup>.

"Madhva interprets the statement of the Gita iii.3, that there are two different groups of *Adhikaris* in the world, called *Samkhyas* and *Yogas*, to mean that there are two orders of beings among the wise and eligible souls (i) the select 'few' (*Jnananisthah*) like Sanaka and other born

yogis who pursue the path of knowledge do the exclusion of all Karma (in its external form) of and (ii) all other enlightened beings, including some of the divinely appointed leaders of society like king Janaka, Priyavrata and others, who though highly enlightened, have been 'Commissioned by the Divine will to follow the path of active Karma and serve as an example of disinterested action in their fellow-men and guide them (*loka sangraha*). The average run of humanity has, therefore, necessity to work through Karma"<sup>48</sup>.

"But this Karma is not to be viewed in the narrow hedonistic or ritualistic sense of the *Mimamsakas*. Madhva overcomes the difficult here, by distinguishing the Karma-Yoga of the Gita from what the other philosophers call the *Pravrttimarga* of the Vedas. He points out, on sound textual authority, that the latter is deserved by censured in the Gita and other *Sastras* and that true *Nivrtti-marga* is not what the other commentators think it to be, viz., the abandonment of all Karmas, but it is active performance in a spirit of devotion and dispassion"<sup>49</sup>.

"*niskamam jnanapurva tu nivrttamiha cosyate*" (vyasa-smrti).

"This is indeed the true spirit of '*sannyasa*' and Naiskarma, inculcated in the Gita. Hence it is that Madhva propounds a new theory of typical Vedic injunction which are almost invariably followed by goodly promise of attractive rewards to come: '*jyotistomena svargakamo yajet*'. He suggests that the purpose of these prescriptions is, paradoxically enough, to wean us away from the attractions of perishable rewards and pull us up gradually to a life of disinterested action (*Niskama Karma*), even as a child is induced by its mother to take a medicinal dose of

castor oil, by the tempting offer of sweets in reward. '*rocanartha phalasruthi*' <sup>50</sup>.

"It is estimated that on an average, it takes at least ten future births for an individual to work out the amount of Karma accumulated by him from the fourteen years of his life, in one birth". Then it would be a vain hope to expect to work it out by enjoyment. Therefore by the help of Jnana, the past karma can be destroyed or neutralised. Such a power of destroying the accumulated load of past Karma, or rendering it nugatory is ascribed to the actual vision (*aparoksajnana*) of God, through meditation. Therefore Madhva regards enlightened activity (*Niskamakarma*) merely as contributing to such knowledge through *Vairagya*" <sup>51</sup>.

"Then Karma - Yoga is not at all a stumbling block to spiritual progress. It is not, by itself, binding in its effects as it depends on the motive behind it and the end in view with which it is performed. "That is why the Madhva maintains that every approved activity after the dawn of *Aparoksa* has its reward in the form of a welling up of spiritual bliss (*anandodreka*) and never goes in vain" <sup>52</sup>.

*'Na hasya Karma Kseeyate'* (Brhadaranyakopanisad)

Thus Madhva is quite clear that disinterested activity carried on in a spirit of devotion to God is a powerful incentive to the acquisition of knowledge which alone is the highest means of release. Karma, Dhyana and others are just accessories to it. This was explained in his Gita Bhasya. There is no place for the theory of Jnana-Karma-Samuccaya

in his Dvaita. But it can be stated that Madhva has blazed a new trail in interpreting the message of Karma-Yoga of Isavasyopanisad and Gita by bringing '*Jnanottara Karma*' back to its rightful place in the spiritual life of man at its highest stage of realization.

Madhva has given a unique place to Divine grace in his system, in making it the ultimate cause of self-realization and God-realization. But without the grace of God, one will not get *moksa*. This can only be achieved by Bhakti as the deepest attachment to the Lord, deep-rooted and based on a clear understanding of his greatness and majesty.

The point in Madhva's insistence on *Mahatmyajnana* as one of the constituents of Bhakti is that a blind and ignorant devotion is of no philosophical worth. Since the function of Bhakti is to manifest the true relation of Jiva to Brahman, it must naturally be properly informed about the true relation, which presupposes a right knowledge of the majesty and greatness of God as the one *Svatantra*. Hence Bhakti has to be enriched by study, reflection, and concentration. So it is inferred that a mere wave of sentimentalism or emotionalism is not Bhakti to Madhva. It is the outcome of patient study and deep reflection. Madhva also demands a high degree of moral perfection from the true devotee of God. And he affirms that there can be no true devotion to God without a real sense of moral purity, sincerity of purpose and detachment to worldly pleasures. Without the cultivation of a distaste for the pleasures of the world, the true devotion to God is highly impossible. Purity of life in all aspects is required for true devotion and knowledge. Devotion without such purity will be a travesty. Complete control of the passions of the flesh, calmness of mind, impartiality of conduct and love of God are

emphasized by Madhva as the prerequisites of devotion and knowledge.

Madhva's conception of Bhakti avoids erotic form of Bhakti and remains at its exalted intellectual and spiritual levels of firm philosophic devotion to the Supreme Lord of the universe who is to be worshipped with loving attachment as the *Bimba* of all *Pratibimb*as (Jivas)<sup>53</sup>.

But it is not on that account lacking in intensity of fervour and feeling. For Madhva has recognized in the clearest terms that Bhakti is in essence an ineffable blending of the emotion and the intellect.

Madhva's distinctive doctrine of intrinsic gradation of fitness among various orders of souls enables him to correlate the different forms of devotion to different orders of selves. In his view, *Kama-Bhakti* or erotic devotion is the special privilege of *Apsaras*as and ought not to be practised by the others. And Madhva strongly disapproves of *Dvesa* Bhakti. "Madhva speaks of three different types of devotees. 1) *Uttama Bhaktas* 2) *Madhyama Bhaktas* and 3) *Adhama Bhaktas*, according to the nature and intensity of devotional characteristic of them. Bhakti, then, is the outcome of a profound admiration for Divine majesty coupled with a spontaneous love and regard for the Supreme. It cannot be dissociated from knowledge. But this knowledge of God is not the cold intellectual apprehension of reality. It is a vivid perception of the supreme reality as the pivot of one's own reality, consciousness, and bliss with the utmost warmth of love and attraction for one's own *Bimba* that soul is capable of"<sup>54</sup>.

Gradational approach in the practice of Bhakti is necessary element of the doctrine of Bhakti as propounded by Madhva. According to Madhva, the devotional homage to the gods and the sages in the spiritual hierarchy is not a matter of courtesy. It is a must. Any scheme of Bhakti which does not include in its scope the gods, *rsis*, and other superior beings, according to *Taratamya*, is bound to be futile. He has thus brought about a remarkable integration between the supposedly endless polytheism of the Hindu scriptures with the fundamental monotheism of rational philosophy with the help of the concept of *Taratamya* in which each of the *Devatas* has his need of honour without being mistaken for the one superior to him or displacing him.

"Madhva distinguishes three stages of Bhakti : 1) that which precedes *Paroksa jnana* (mediate knowledge of the Deity), 2) One that follows it, and 3) a third that comes after direct realisation (*Aparoksa jnana*) and wins the absolute grace (*atyartha prasada*) of the Lord. It is the final stage of Bhakti that fully manifests, by the grace of God the true relationship that exists between the Jiva and Brahman and completes the fulfilment of realization viz. the full manifestation and enjoyment of the intrinsic bliss of one's own self and the majesty of the Lord." These three stages of Bhakti have been denoted by Jayatirtha as *Pakvabhakti*, *Paripakvabhakti*, and *Ati-paripakva bhakti*"<sup>55</sup>. Of these, *Pakvabhakti* (ripe devotion) is means of acquiring knowledge of God. The other disciplines of *sravana* and *manana* just pave the way for it. Similarly, *Paripakva - Bhakti* is the means of direct vision of the Lord and not *Dhyana*, as such, which is only the means to achieve such a state of *Paripakva - Bhakti*. Lastly, *Ati-Paripakva-Bhakti* (mellowed devotion), consists in the welling up of the spiritual joy of communion

with Lord. The visualizing of the Lord as one's *Bimbarupa* paves the way for this final beatitude of *sadhyanandaphalanubhava*, through *Paripakva - Bhakti*<sup>66</sup>.

And according to Madhva, only the Lord's grace has the power to rend the veil of *Bhavarupajnana* which stands between the Jiva and the Lord concealing his face from the devotee and prevents the full manifestation of the bliss of *moksa*. Madhva has also done some hard thinking on the interrelation between Jnana and Bhakti. He does not make them mutually exclusive *Sadhanas*. His special contribution lies in integrating them into a single mould of love of God founded on an adequate understanding of his majesty. *Mahatmyajnana* and *Sneha* are integral aspects of Bhakti.

It was Madhva who replaced Sankara's theory that liberation is to be attained by jnana alone with its national corollary, in Sankara's sense, of the unreality of bondage and enthroned in its place the doctrine of the reality of bondage and its removal, in the last analysis, by the grace of God alone.

Madhva has completely fulfilled the highest expectation of a theistic interpreter of Vedanta by giving equitable justice to Jnana and Bhakti, in restoring the doctrine of Bhakti and Divine grace to their rightful place and proper perspective in the texts and tradition of Prasthanatraya .

According to Madhva "Brahman possesses every kind of perfection. It is identified with Visnu and is said to direct by his will the world and all that is in it as an absolute ruler. He creates and destroys the

world again and again. He is endowed with a supernatural body and is regarded as transcendent to the world as well as immanent, since he is the inner ruler (*antaryamin*) of all souls. He manifests himself in various forms (*vyuhas*), appears periodically in incarnations (*avataras*) and is said to be mystically present in the sacred images. By his side is Lakshmi, capable of assuming various forms, but without a material body, co-eternal with him and all pervading. She witnesses the glory of God through eternity. Unlike the gods and goddesses who acquire release after many existences, Lakshmi is eternally redeemed (*nityamukta*). Lakshmi is the personification of God's creative energy. She is intelligent *Prakrti*, through God is greater than she in point of subtlety and the extent of qualities. God rules the souls and matter, though he does not create them from nothing or reduce them to nothing. He is efficient but not material cause of the universe"<sup>57</sup>. It is contradicting with the Brahma-Sutras 1) '*atmakrte parinama'* and 2) '*yoniscahigiyate*' which say that the Brahman is the both efficient and material cause of the Universe.

So far the philosophy of Madhvacarya has been reviewed in different angles. Here it has to be critically analysed in relation to Paripurna Rajayoga. The Dvaita philosophy of Madhva is incomplete and not independent system because one has to wait for God's grace in order to get *moksa*. Even if one practises disinterested actions in a spirit of devotion to God, he does not get *moksa* without the grace of God. By God's wish and will, one will get *moksa*. Hence it can be said that the Dvaita system is not independent system to get *moksa*. Moreover the Brahman is infinite, Jiva is finite, and these two are completely different from each other. But it is a contradiction because the finite Jiva does



not co-exists besides the infinite Brahman. It is a flaw in Dvaita.

In relation to Paripurna Rajayoga, the Brahman, which was explained by Madhva, is not an absolute one. The ultimate absolute reality is Paripurna Brahman which is beyond of Brahman of Madhva. It is neither efficient nor material cause of this world. It is explained as:

" *atmatitam kevalatma*  
*deho nasti kadacana*  
*asti nastiti ko veda*  
*nirnayo nasti sarvada* "58

The *kevalatma* (Paripurna Brahman) is beyond of Atman or Brahman. It means that Paripurna Brahman is beyond of the Dvaitic system. Paripurna Brahman does not have either body or soul. And for that there is no description and determination. And it is also said in Sarvasarapurnopanisad:

" *prajnana hina vakyatma*  
*tatvamasyadi varjitam*  
*brahmoham bhava hinatma*  
*ayamatmeti varjitam*  
*pranavartha vihinatma*  
*laksya vacya vivarjitaha*  
*dvaitadvaita vihinatma*  
*dvayadosa vivarjitaha* " 59

Hence it is concluded that Paripurna Brahman is devoid of Dvaita

and Advaita. And in Anantopanisd, it is again said as following:

" *dvaitadvaita vihinanca*  
*dharmadharma vivarjitam*  
*bandhabandhadi rahitam*  
*amrtamcasti sarvada* " <sup>60</sup>

Hence the Brahman, which is said by Madhva, is not Paripurna Brahman, but it is Yeruka only.

According to Sukarahasyopanisd:

" *karyopadhi rayam jivah*  
*karanopadhirisvarah*  
*karyakarana tam hitva*  
*purna bodhova sisya* " <sup>61</sup>

Paripurna Brahman is remaining when Isvara and Jiva are not existing at all.

" *sarvam visesam neti netiti vihaya*  
*yadava sisya te tadadvayam brahma* " <sup>62</sup> - from Advayataraka Upanisd.

Paripurna Brahman does not have any characteristics. Hence it is clear that the Brahman which is taught by Madhva is not Paripurna Brahman. But it is Yeruka which is cause of universe and which consists all characteristics that are enough for creation, sustenance, and

dissolution of the world. Unless one is out of this Yeruka, he will be in the chain of the birth and death. According to his Karma, he will reach different destinations in this Yeruka only. But he never goes beyond of this Yeruka (Brahman).

Hence it is inferred that by Dvaita system one cannot see the Paripurna Brahman, but one can reach different states of Yeruka only.

It has been seen that all main yoga systems such as Karma-Yoga, Bhakti-Yoga, and Jnana-Yoga have been examined as to their comprehensiveness and completeness in relation to three main schools of Vedanta. But any one of these schools does not indicate the ultimate absolute reality i.e. Paripurna Brahman. It is beyond of the scope of these yogic systems of the Vedanta. The Brahman, which is explained by all three schools, is nothing but Yeruka, which is the real cause of the world. But according to theory of Paripurna Rajayoga, these yoga systems are not separate or different, but rather complementary to one another and these together constitute the complete view of Yoga, which leads to Paripurna Rajayoga.

## REFERENCES

1. Yilapakurthi Vira Venkata Ramchandra Rao. Paripurna Darshanamu, 1st edition, 1965, P. 99.
2. Swami Madhavananda, Vivekacudamani, Advaita Ashrama, Calcutta, 15 Impression, 1998, P. 11.
3. Karel Werner, Yoga and Indian philosophy, Motilal Banarsidass, Reprint 1980, P. 143-145.
4. Vidyananda Prakashagiri (Trans), Upanishadratanakaramu, 3rd Reprint, Sri Suka Brahmashramamu, Srikalahasti, 1994, P. 57.
5. Yilapakurthi Vira Venkata Ramachandra Rao, Paripurna Darshanamu, P. 189.
6. Swami Gambhirananda (Trans), Eight Upanisads, Vol I Advaita Ashram, Calcutta, 3rd Reprint , 1996, P. 48.
7. ibid, P. 52.
8. ibid, P. 213.
9. ibid, P. 216.
10. Swami Gambhirananda (Trans), Eight Upanisads, Vol II, Advaita Ashrama, Calcutta, 11th impression, 1998, P. 82.
11. Swarni Vireswarananda, (Trans) Brahma Sutras, Advaita Ashrama, Calcutta, 7th impression, 1996, P. 74.
12. ibid, P. 173.
13. Swami Gambhirananda, Eight Upanisads, Advaita Ashrama, 3rd Reprint, 1996, P. 304.

14. Sri Vidyananda Prakashagiri (Trans), Upanishadratanakaramu, Sri Sukabrahmashramamu, Srikalahasti, 3rd reprint, 1994, P. 46.
15. Swami Vireshwarananda (Trans), Brahma-Sutras, Advaita Ashrama, Calcutta, 7th impression., 1996, P. 20.
16. ibid, P. 83.
17. ibid, P. 130.
18. ibid, P. 74.
19. ibid, P. 139
20. ibid, P. 139
21. ibid, P. 163 - 164
22. ibid, P. 165
23. Swami Gambhirananda (Trans), Bhagavad Gita, Advaita Ashrama, Calcutta, 2nd edition, 1991, P. 323.
24. ibid, P. 374 - 375.
25. ibid, P. 376.
26. ibid, P. 384.
27. ibid, P. 425
28. ibid, P. 569.
29. ibid, P. 570

30. ibid, P. 600
31. ibid, P. 179
32. Swami Madhavananda (Trans), Vivekacudamani, Advaita Ashrama, Calcutta, 15th impression, 1998, P. 20.
33. Sri Panditharadhy Panditha Shivananda Swami, Srimadachalabodha Shikhamani, 1st edition, 1929, P. 57
34. Yilapakurthi Vira Venkata Ramchandra Rao, Paripurna Darshanamu, 1st edition, 1965, P. 121.
35. Animasen Guptha, A critical study of the philosophy of Ramanuja, the chowkhamba Sanskrit series office, 1967, P.141.
36. ibid, P. 141.
37. Swami Adidevananda (Trans), Sri Ramanuja Gita Bhasya, Sri Ramakrishna Math, Madras, P. 169
38. Animasen Gupta, A critical study of the philosophy of Ramanuja, the chowkhamba sanskrit series office, 1967, P. 145.
39. ibid, P. 146.
40. ibid, P. 147.
41. ibid, P. 151.
42. ibid, P. 151.
43. ibid, P. 152.
44. M. Rajagopal Rao & P.C.Subbamma, Bharatiya Darshanamu, 1st edition, Telugu Akademi, 1971, P. 172.

45. Swami Gambhirananda (Trans), Bhagavad Gita. (Trans), Advaita Ashrama, Calcutta, 2nd edition. 1991. P. 281.
46. ibid, P. 329.
47. B.N.K.Sharma, Philosophy of Sri Madhvacarya, revised edition, Motilal Banarsidass, 1986, P. 384.
48. ibid, P.384 - 385.
49. ibid, P. 385.
50. ibid, P. 385.
51. ibid, P. 386 - 387.
52. ibid, P. 387.
53. B.N.K.Sharma, Sri Madhva's Teachings in his own words, 2nd edition, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1970, P. 94.
54. B.N.K.Sharma, Philosophy of Sri Madhvacarya, revised edition, Motilal Banarsidass, 1986, P. 396.
55. ibid, P. 398-399.
56. ibid, P. 403.
57. Radhakrishnan.S, Indian Philosophy, Vol.II, 8th impression, London, George Allen & unwin Ltd, 1966, P. 742-743.
58. Yilapakurthi Viravenkata Ramachandra Rao (Trans), Bhrantirahita Slokamulu, 1st edition, 1983, P. 78
59. Bhagavata Krishna Desikulu, Anustanavidhi, Rajayogashramam, 1995, P. 39.

60. ibid, P. 34
61. Sri Vidyananda Prakashagiri (Trans), Upanishadratanakaramu, 3rd edition, Sri Sukabrahmashramam, 1994, P. 142.
62. ibid, P. 235.



---

## **CHAPTER - IV**

### **THE ROLE AND PLACE OF PARIPURNA RAJAYOGA IN RELATION TO EMERGENT INDIAN PHILOSOPHICAL SYSTEMS**

## CHAPTER - IV

### THE ROLE AND PLACE OF PARIPURNA RAJAYOGA IN RELATION TO EMERGENT INDIAN PHILOSOPHICAL SYSTEMS

First of all the main systems of yoga are to be reviewed in relation to Paripurna Rajayoga. Later the role and place of Paripurna Rajayoga in relation to emergent Indian philosophical systems is to be critically reviewed by using the excerpts from the Vedas, Upanisads, Brahma-Sutras, and Bhagavad Gita etc., for its completeness and comprehensiveness.

The method of practising of actions without assuming doer-ship (*kartrtva rahita karmacarana*) is the skilfulness in performing the actions (*yogah karmasu kousalam*) and it is called real Yoga. In other words Yoga is *samadarsana* of universal form of *Adhistana* Brahman. '*Kartrtva rahita karmacarana*' is called Yoga according to Dayananda Rajayogi.

#### KARMA-YOGA:

According to Dayananda Ponnala Rajayogi, if the action done by *karmendriyas* which are preceded by the determination of *buddhi*, then it is called Karma -Yoga. Hence Buddhi -Yoga is also known as Karma-Yoga. The persons who have control over the *karmendriyas* and got fruits of actions by practising Astanga -Yoga are called

Karma-Yogis. While performing the actions, one has to observe non-doer-ship and vice-versa. Then he is said to be the knower of the secret of Karma. In that case even if he lives either in a forest or in a city, he will perform actions without stoppage. Then he is known as a real Karma - Yogi<sup>1</sup>.

### **JNANA-YOGA:**

The *parinama* of Jnana, in the form of *Jnanendriyas* will know *sabda, sparsa, rupa, rasa, and gandha* (*visayapancaka*) and it determines any thing by *Buddhi*. This is Jnana-Yoga. The persons who follows this are called Jnana-Yogis. They will know the *visayapancaka* with the help of *Jnanendriyas*, but the *visayapancaka* will not be determined in the form of *Buddhi* and will go out through *Jnanendriyas* as they came in. This way they will do *Sahajarupa karmacarana* (The way of natural form of doing actions)<sup>2</sup>. This is the way of Jnana-Yogis who are also known as *Samkhyas*.

### **BHAKTI-YOGA:**

The harmonious coordination between Jnana and Karma is called Bhakti-Yoga. That means there must be harmony between *manas*, mind which is a source of knowledge and *Sarira*, body which is an instrument to perform actions. If the harmony exists, it is called Bhakti or else it is *Vibhakti*. In other words the *trikarana suddhi* or *manovakkaya suddhi* is called Bhakti-Yoga<sup>3</sup>.

The action must be preceded by knowledge. Bhakti is not for the sake of Bhakti only and also Jnana is not for the sake of Jnana only, but Jnana and Bhakti must be practised by performing actions without fear. The love with fear is called Bhakti. The love of God (atman) is the greatest of all. According to *Sruti* '*mamatma sarva bhutatma*' the Atman which is in me is in the *upadhis* ranging from a clump of grass to Brahman. The Atman is the most lovable thing among the worldly materials. For all living beings, their atman is the most lovable for them. This atman is in the control of *trikaranas*. What are *trikaranas*? What is its *Suddhi*? . What is determined by mind that has to be spoken by tongue. So is to be done by the body. The people who follow this method strictly are called '*punyatmas*'. The others are called '*papatmas*'. The atman is the most lovable of all. There is no more lovable thing than one's atman. So one should not hurt one's atman with inconsistency of *trikaranas*. Hence one must maintain the consistency among mind, speech, and body; thereby his atman is purified. This is real Bhakti-Yoga according to Dayananda Rajayogi.

Hence it can be said that by synthesizing these two yoga systems such as Karma - Yoga and Jnana - Yoga harmoniously together is known as a Bhakti - Yoga and transcending from that Bhakti - Yoga, one leads to Paripurna Rajayoga by which he can be liberated from *samsara*.

Paripurna Rajayoga: 'Paripurna' means complete or absolute and 'Rajayoga' means yoga which is king of all yogic systems or royal path. Hence it is also known as the top most yoga system.

According to Paripurna Rajayoga, the union of Jnana and Karma harmoniously together is called Bhakti-Yoga. First of all the *Sadhaka* has to acquire real knowledge of Brahman and Paripurna Brahman and then all the actions performed by him must be preceded by that knowledge. And there must be a harmony between Jnana and Karma. This is called Bhakti-Yoga. After attaining this Bhakti-Yoga and *trikarana suddhi*, one has to perceive the transcendental Paripurna Brahman, the ultimate absolute reality. Then he has to perform all actions without assuming the doer-ship but with *trikarana suddhi*. That leads to the liberation from the illusion of the cycle of birth and death.

In this context, it is inevitable to review Paripurna Rajayoga for clear understanding of its role and place. Here few questions can be raised. Why purification is required to Atman? How does it lead to liberation and what is Paripurna Brahman? How is it different from Brahman or Atman? Onto whom the devotee is to be concentrated or meditated? What is to be devoted? Finally who is a real devotee or liberated person? All these questions can be answered by reviewing the Paripurna Rajayoga.

#### **THE SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF THE PARIPURNA RAJAYOGA:**

'*Vedokhilo Dharmamulam*' and '*Sarvam Vedatprasidhyati*' are being told. Because the Vedas were not written by a single *rsi*. Because of various results of researches of various *rsis*, harmony is not maintained in the Vedas. Hence one can see the basic principles of even *sunyavada* also in the Vedas. The fathomable concepts were

told directly by the Vedas, but unfathomable Paripurna Brahman was not conveyed directly. But it was indicated as a *lakshyarthā*<sup>4</sup> of *Adhistana Cetana* Brahman (Yeruka). Even this *Adhistana Cetana* Brahman was indicated as a *lakshyarthā*. *Acala* *rsis* noticed the absence of birth and death in this yoga only and they preached this only to their disciples, and as a heritage, until now, it is in Andhra Pradesh, India.

Bhagavata Krishna Desikulu, who belonged to 19th century, one of the greatest exponents of this yoga, in his major work of '*Kandarthas*' conveyed the essence of this doctrine in one sentence i.e. "*paripurnamu, lenerukanu yerigi; yerukanu manumu*" i.e. know Paripurna Brahman and Non-existing Yeruka then renounce Yeruka. This can also be conveyed by following *sloka*.

"*asariram sarvadasti sariram rahitam sada  
ayameva sadyo muktiranyadha bhrama karanam*"<sup>5</sup>

In this *sloka*, both the metaphysical determination and the duty of disciple are being preached. The realization of Paripurna Brahman and Yeruka in the presence of *paripurna guru* belongs to the metaphysical determination and the abandonment of Yeruka belongs to the duty of disciple. Hence here are only three basic words of this yoga:

(1) *Acala* Paripurna Brahman or Paripurna Brahman

(2) Yeruka (*Saguna nirguna Swarupa Adhistana Cetana* Brahman) or Brahman

(3) The way of renouncing Yeruka.

The most important point is that there are two Brahmans<sup>6</sup>. One is completely differing from the other. There is no link or relation between them. One is Paripurna Brahman and the other is Brahman.

It is said in Mundaka Upanisad :

*'tasmai sa hovaca dve vidye veditavye  
iti hasma yad Brahma vido vadanti para caivaparaca'*

To him he said : "there are two kinds of knowledge to be acquired - the *para* means the Paripurna Brahman which is different from Brahman and the *apara* means the Brahman or Yeruka which is real cause of the world"<sup>7</sup>.

The same is said in Amrtabindupanisad :

*'dve vidya veditaye tu sabda brahma paramcayat  
sabda brahmani nisnatah parambrahmadhigaccati'*<sup>8</sup>

There are two kinds of knowledge to be known. One is regarding *Sabda* Brahman or Yeruka or Brahman of religious exponents and the other is Param Brahman or Paripurna Brahman which is different from Brahman (Yeruka). In these two if *Sabda* Brahman or Yeruka

is known clearly and thoroughly, then it is very easy to know about Paripurna Brahman. It is again said in Mundaka Upanisad :

*'tatrapara rgvedo yajurvedo samavedo dharvavedah  
siksha kalpo vyakaranam niruktam cando jyotisamiti  
atha para yaya tadaksara madhigamyate'*<sup>9</sup>

Of these two, Brahman or Yeruka comprises the Rig-Veda, Yajur-Veda, Sama-Veda, Atharva-Veda, the science of pronunciation etc., the code of rituals, grammar, etymology, metre, and astrology. But Paripurna Brahman (*para*) is different from this which is to be known that imperishable.

That is why Krishna said in Gita : '*traigunya visaya veda  
nistraigunyo bhavarjuna.*'

The Vedas deal with subjects coming under the three *gunas*. O Arjuna, be above the three *gunas*, free from the dualities. Thus Krishna teaches to Arjuna. That means Krishna is indirectly teaching Arjuna to know about the Paripurna Brahman which is *para*. All the theory of Paripurna Rajayoga can be explained elaborating the three sentences.

#### **(1) PARIPURNA BRAHMAN:**

In the words of Siva Rama Dikshitulu, Paripurna Brahman means:  
" It does not have birth and death, evolution and dissolution, and it exists in all places, all times, all substances, and it has no origin and



end, no motion, no transformations, and it exists itself everywhere"<sup>10</sup>.

'*Yato vaco nivartante aprapya manasa saha*'<sup>11</sup> denotes that Paripurna Brahman is unfathomable to mind and is inexplicable by tongue. Hence it is impossible to describe more comprehensively than this. Actually, it is not a definition at all. It is said for the sake of explanation for disciples. Why is it not a definition for that? Because all those words in this explanation are relative words only. But Paripurna Brahman is non-relative, i.e. absolute. So one cannot describe it by relative words. It is a mistake, if it is described by words. Though it is needed to describe it in some way. What is that way? '*Neti neti netihovaca*'. "It is not", "It is not", describing in this way, one can adduce that every thing is not Paripurna Brahman. Yeruka<sup>is</sup> no where but Paripurna Brahman exists everywhere. In this way, Paripurna Brahman is to be indicated.

Paripurna Brahman cannot be portrayed by words or it cannot be perceivable by mind. It is absolute. Its quality is an exceptional quality of all qualities. It exists in the absence of all duals such as *Atman-Anatman*, *Sat-Asat*, *Cit - Acit*, *Cetana - Acetana* and *Bhava - Abhava* etc. Hence, is it a blank? No, it is not a blank, because in that state nobody is there to recognise whether it is a blank (*sunya*) or anything else. Hence it is not a blank. If any one realised it, he could not say anything about it in any manner. Hence all remained calm. At last, it can be said that '*Astityevopa labdavyah*'<sup>12</sup> i.e. it is existing. But this reflects nonexistence, a relative word. Hence it is not both the existing and non-existing substance. Even though it cannot be indicated by not saying it, as '*asti*' or 'existing', there is no

other go to indicate it. Hence even if it is a relative word, it is used to indicate Paripurna Brahman.

Paripurna Brahman does not have dual nature such as *Jiva - Isvara*, *Prakrti - Purusa*, *Vidya - Avidya*, *Jnana - Ajnana* etc. Similarly *Jnana - Jneya - Jnatru* an internal trio, *drasta - drk - drsya* a middle trio, and *karta-karma-kriya* an external trios are not existing in it.

Paripurna Brahman is not a *saccidananda* substance and is not a *saksi* (witness). It is neither a gross nor a subtle. It is neither consciousness nor unconsciousness nor their unified state. One cannot find either consciousness or transformational unconsciousness or knowledge or wisdom or symbol in Paripurna Brahman. There is nothing other than Paripurna Brahman. '*Brahmanonyam nakincana*'.

The characteristics of Paripurna Brahman can be drawn from the *srutis* of important scriptures in the following ways.

- (1) '*acchedyoya madahyoya makledyo sosyayevaca nityassarva gatah sthanuracaloyam sanatanah.*'<sup>13</sup>  
(Bhagavad Gita)
- (2) '*sarvadanavaccinnam brahma, kala bhedom vastu bhedom, desa bhedom, svabhedakam, kincidbhedom natasyasti, kincidvyapi navidyate*'<sup>14</sup> (Yogacudamani Upanisad)
- (3) '*tadeva brahmatvam viddhi nedam yadida mupasate*'<sup>15</sup>

(Kenopanisad)

- (4) *'svayameva param brahma purnamadvaya makriyam'* <sup>16</sup>  
(Adhyatma Upanisad)
- (5) *'ya evam nirbhijam veda, nirbhija eva sabhavati'* <sup>17</sup>
- (6) *'karyopadhirayam jivah  
karanopadhirisvarah  
karyakarana tam hitva  
purna bodhova sisystate'* <sup>18</sup> (Sukarahasyopanisad)
- (7) *'na tatra caksur gaccati na vaggaccati no manah na vidmo  
na vijaniyo, yadhaiva tadanusisyadanya devatadvidita dadho  
aviditadadhi iti susruma purvesa yenastadvya ca caksire'* <sup>19</sup>  
(Kenopanisad)
- (8) *'yato vaco nivartante aprapya manasasaha'* <sup>20</sup> (Taittiriopanisad).
- (9) *'naiva vaca na manasa praptum sakyonaca caksusa astiti  
bruvatonyatra katham tadupalabhyate'* <sup>21</sup>. (Kathopanisad)
- (10) *'apranohyamanah ssubhrohysarat paratah parah'*.  
(Mundakopanisad)
- (11) *'asthulamananva mahrasva, madirga, masabda, masparsa,  
marupa, mavyayam.'* (Brhadaranyakopanisad)

- (12) *'asabda masparsa marupa mavyayam, tatharasam nityamagandha vacchayat, anadyanantam mahatah param druvam nicayyatam mrtyu mukhatpramucyate.'*<sup>22</sup>
- (13) *'nasadasinnosadasitta danim...'* (Rg-Veda, Nasadiya Suktam, first mantra)
- (14) *'...nasattanna saducyate'*<sup>23</sup> (Bhagavad Gita - 13 - 13)
- (15) *'anyatradharmat, anyatradharmadanyatrasmatkrta krtat, anyatrabhutacchabhavyaccha yattatpasyati tadvada.'*<sup>24</sup>
- (16) *'jneyavastu parityage vilayayati manasam, manase vilayam yati kaivalya mavasisyate.'*<sup>25</sup> (Sandilyopanisad)
- (17) *'drastu darsana drsyanam viramoyatrava bhavet.'*<sup>26</sup> (Tejobindupanisad)
- (18) *'yatra nanyat pasyati, nanyaccrunoti, nanyadvijanati sa bhuma'*<sup>27</sup>. (Candogyopanisad)
- (19) *'sarvamvisesam netinetiti vihaya yadavasisya tetadadvayam brahma.'*<sup>28</sup> ( Advayataraka Upanisad)
- (20) *'adhata adeso netineti.'* (Brhadaranyakopanisad)
- (21) *'yasyakincit bahirnasti kincidantah kiyaccana yasya lingam prapancamva brahmaivatma na samsayah.'* (Tejobindupanisad)

(22) '*brahma sabdena tadbrahma svaprakasatma rupakam  
etadbhava vinirmuktam tadbrahma brahmatatparam*'  
(Tejobindupanisad)

(23) '*sa esa neti netyatma grhyonahi grhyatesiryo  
nahisiryatesangonahi sajyatesito navyadhate,  
narisyati*'. (Brhadaranyakopanisad)

**(2) BRAHMAN (YERUKA):** Yeruka is whichever other than Paripurna Brahman. With reference to Paripurna Brahman, nothing will be existing. Except Paripurna Brahman, there is no existence for anything else. Hence Yeruka is called 'Non existing Yeruka' (*leneruka*) in this yogic system.

Yeruka is the real cause of evolution and dissolution of action oriented Universe. Yeruka is the basis for all substances of Universe. In dissolution, this entire Universe gets subtle form and again in recreation, it gets gross form. It is nothing but fusion and fission. Hence Yeruka is getting changes only between subtle and gross states. Some researchers say there is only *sat* substance before creation, the others say *asat* substance according to *srutis*. But the essence of all is Yeruka which was there before creation and it was both *sat* and *asat* as well as *sadasat*. '*Sadasaccahamarjuna*'<sup>29</sup>. Yeruka is smaller than an atom and also bigger than the biggest. '*Anoraniyan mahato mahiyan*'<sup>30</sup>. It exists in and out of the Universe.

It is *Panchabhutas* (five elements viz space, air, fire, water and earth), *Panchatanmatras* (five senses viz *sabda*, *sparsa*, *rupa*, *rasa*

and *gandha*), and universal forms. And Yeruka is both witness and doer as well as enjoyer. It is both unity and multiplicity as well as all forms. It is *aham* (self), *tvam* (jiva), and *tat* (supreme self). And it is *asi* (unified state). All are Yeruka. And if it does not exist, only Paripurna Brahman exists. All names, forms and actions are Yeruka. Both the minute creature and the Universe as well as their 'selves' are Yeruka. All duals and trios are Yeruka. All powers are Yeruka.

It has contraction and rarefaction. It is cause and effect itself. Both unconsciousness and consciousness are Brahman (Yeruka). Consciousness in unconsciousness and unconsciousness in consciousness are interwoven. They are inseparable. These are coming and existing each with the other. And of these two, one cannot exist without the other. If one goes, the other goes with it only. It is the quality of substance<sup>31</sup>. All substances in this Universe are like this only. Of these two either consciousness or unconsciousness is not *mithya*. These two are Yeruka. Of these two none is Paripurna Brahman.

Yeruka which is the cause and effect itself and has *saguna nirguna* qualities cannot be Paripurna Brahman. Hence 'Brahman' which has been indicated by the Advaita concept is not other than the original form of Yeruka (*Adhistana cetana* Brahman). Hence it is inferred that there are two Brahman. One is Paripurna Brahman and the other is *Saguna nirguna svarupa adhistana cetana* Brahman. The later one is being called Yeruka by this doctrine.

It is understood that all the three masters of Advaita, Visistadvaita, Dvaita determined the Reality either as *Nirguna* Brahman or as *Saguna* Brahman. Therefore it is clear that all these theories are in the state of Yeruka. But Paripurna Brahman is beyond of Yeruka.

The cause for all is Yeruka, but there is no origin and cause for it other than itself. Hence it is described as self brilliance, *swayambhu* and it appears to it itself only. 'A seed causes a tree and a tree causes a seed'<sup>32</sup> and " Body's cause is soul and soul's cause is body"<sup>33</sup> are very important teachings of *Acalarsi* Bhagavata Krishna Desikulu from his *Kandarthas*, a prominent book. Hence the causation of seed from tree and tree from seed is a self-causation. Similarly, Yeruka is both soul and body as well as their unified form. Here soul is the subtle form of Yeruka and body is the gross form of it. There is no other cause for this unified state other than itself. Hence it has no cause and there is no place to stand in Paripurna Brahman. Hence it is being called as 'Non-existing Yeruka' (*Ieneruka*). This is the doctrine of Paripurna Rajayoga.

The characteristics of Brahman (Yeruka) can be drawn from various *srutis* of important scriptures in the following ways:

- (1) '*tadejati, tannaijati, taddure, tadvantike, tadantarasya sarvasya, tadu sarvasyasya bahyatah.*'<sup>34</sup> (*Isha Upanisad*)
- (2) '*brahmai veda mamrtam, purastat brahma pascad brahma dakshina tascottarena*

*adhascordhvanca prasrtam brahmaivedam  
visvamidam varistam.*'<sup>35</sup> (Mundakopanisad)

- (3) '*yatova yimani bhutani jayanti, enajatani jivanti, yatprayantyabhi  
samvisanti, tadvijijnasasvatadbrahmeti.*'<sup>36</sup> (Taittiriopanisad)
- (4) '*manasaivanu drastavyam, neha nanasti kincana.*'<sup>37</sup>  
(Brhadaranyakopanisad)
- (5) '*etadjneyam, nityamevatma samstham natah param veditavyam  
hi kincit, bhoktabhogyam preritaramca matva sarvam proktam  
trividham brahmame tat.*'<sup>38</sup> (Sveta svataropanisad)
- (6) '*sarvatah panipadam tat sarvatoksi siromukham, sarvatah sruti  
malloke sarvamavrtya tistati.*'<sup>39</sup> (Bhagavad Gita)
- (7) '*anoraniyan mahato mahiyanatmasyajam tornihito guhayam*'<sup>40</sup>.  
(Kathopanisad)
- (8) '*...atmanastu kamaya patih priyobhavati, ...atmanastu kamaya  
jaya priyabhavati, atmanastu kamaya putrah priyabhavanti,  
atmanastu kamaya vittam priyam bhavati, atmanastu kamaya  
brahmam priyam bhavati, atmanastu kamaya ksatram priyam  
bhavati, atmanastu kamaya loka priyabhavanti, atmanastu  
kamaya devah priya bhavanti, atmanastu kamaya bhutani  
priyani bhavanti, atmanastu kamaya sarvam priyam bhavati.*'<sup>41</sup>  
(Brhadaranyakopanisad)



- (9) '*sadeva somyedamagra asit.*'<sup>42</sup> (Candogyopanisad)
- (10) '*asadvayi damagra asit.*'<sup>43</sup> (Taittiriopanisad)
- (11) '*amrtam caiva, mrtusca sadasaccahmarjuna.*'<sup>44</sup>  
(Bhagavad Gita)
- (12) '*nantah prajnah na bahi prajnah ... sa atma savijneyah*'<sup>45</sup>  
(Mandukya Upanisad)
- (13) '*drstim jnana mayim krtva pasyet brahma mayam jagat.*'<sup>46</sup>  
(Tejobindupanisad)
- (14) '*sannapya sannapyu bhayatmikano, bhinnapya bhinnapyu  
bhayatmikano, sanganyananga nyubhayatmikano,  
mahadbhutanirvacaniyarupa.*'<sup>47</sup> (Vivekacudamani)
- (15) '*atmavare drastavya srotavyo mantavyo nidhi dhyasitavyah.*'<sup>48</sup>  
(Brhadaranyakopanisad)

### **(3)THE WAY OF RENOUNCING YERUKA:**

To renounce this illusion of Yeruka or Brahman, one should sit at the feet of an experienced *paripurna guru* and should enquire about the qualities of Yeruka. Then one should obtain the unified state of it, and should observe the nonexistence of it and existence of Paripurna Brahman<sup>49</sup>. If one has achieved this state, one will

be free from all illusions and will be out of the illusion of the cycle of birth and death.

This state can be achieved by Bhakti-Yoga of only (Acala) Paripurna Rajayoga which consists both Jnana-Yoga and Karma-Yoga inside Bhakti-Yoga. How?

*'atmasuddhileni acaramadiyela?  
bhandasuddhileni pakamela?  
cittasuddhileni siva pujalelaya?  
viswadabhirama vinura Vema'*<sup>50</sup>

Because the Atman or Brahman is the real cause of all and all are in it. It has to be purified. Without purifying Atman, what is the use of *acara* or actions? Thus Vemana says in above verse. Then how to make *Atma suddhi*?

*Atma suddhi* can be done by only practising *trikarana suddhi* or *manovakkaya suddhi*. That is whatever is in mind that is to be spoken by tongue. And so is done by body without fear and without assuming doer-ship. This is called real Bhakti-Yoga of Acala Paripurna Rajayoga. And all remaining Bhaktis such as *Bahya Bhakti*, *Ananya Bhakti* and *Ekantha Bhakti* are selfish and dependant.

The same is said on Gita :

*'Kayena manasa buddhya kevalairindriyairapi  
yoginah karma kurvanti sangam taktvjatma suddhaye'.  
(Bhagavad Gita - 5 - 11)*

Renouncing the *sangam*, the cause for all i.e. the Brahman; the yogis are performing actions through the body, mind, and intellect as also mere senses for the purification of the Atman. This is the secret of working. This is "*Yogah Karmasu Kousalam*". This is how *manovakkaya suddhi* leads to real Bhakti-Yoga which leads to *moksa*<sup>51</sup>.

*'sarva dharman parityajya mamekam saranam vraja  
aham tvam sarva papebhyo moksa yisyami masucah'*  
(Bhagavad Gita - 18 - 66)

*Dharma* is that which bears. Atman bears and sustains every thing in the world. Hence the Atman is the cause for all *dharma*s. Hence the renouncement of Atman leads to *moksa-sannyasa-yoga*, the real liberation from all illusions<sup>52</sup>. Even from *moksa*, this can be done in front of a *Paripurna-Guru* like Krishna only. On other hand, if one renounces all other things except himself, he will remain. Then after some time he can take back the things which he has given up. Hence this type of renunciation is not permanent renunciation. Therefore the ultimate state of renunciation is to renounce thyself i.e. to renounce Atman. This method is also known as *moksa-sannyasa-yoga* or *jnana-sannyasa-yoga*.

It is verified how the illusion of Brahman (Yeruka) is removed in relation to the *srutis* of important scriptures in the following ways.

- (1) *'prajnana vakyahinatma  
aham brahmasmi varjitah*

*tatva masyadi hinatma  
ayamatmetyabhavakah'*<sup>53</sup>

(2) *'maha vakyarthato duro  
brahmasmityati duratah  
taccabda varjastvam  
sabdahino vakyartha varjitah'*<sup>54</sup>

(3) *'kevalam turya ruposmi  
turyatitosmi kevalam  
kevalakara ruposmi  
suddha ruposmyaham sada'*<sup>55</sup>

(4) *'atmeti sabdahinoyam atma sabdartha varjitah  
saccidanandahinoyam esaivatma sanatanah'*<sup>56</sup>

(5) *'yadyat svabhi matam vastu tattyaj an moksa masnute'*<sup>57</sup>  
(Mahopanisad)

(6) *'tyaja dharma madharmanca ubhe satya nrtetyaja  
ubhe satyanrtetyaktva yenatyajasi, tatyajah'*<sup>58</sup>

(7) *'ardram jvalati jyoti rahamasmi,  
jyotir jvalati brahmahamasmi,  
yohamasmi brahmahamasmi,  
ahamasmi brahmahamasmi,  
ahamevaham manjuhomi svaha.'*<sup>59</sup>

(8) '*ulka hasto yadha kascit dravya malokya tam tyajet;  
jnanena jneya malokya pascad jnanam parityajet.*'<sup>60</sup>

Hence from above three parts of critical analysis, it is noticed that the destinations of yoga systems of various philosophical systems except Paripurna Rajayoga is either *Saguna* Brahman or *Nirguna* Brahman.

But the Paripurna Rajayoga is nullifying the illusion of the Atman which is the cause for all, and the remaining will be Paripurna Brahman which is exceptional of all qualities and for that way is also a distinctive one and so is its aim. Hence it can be concluded that there is only one way for Paripurna Brahman but so many ways are there for Brahman which again leads to rebirth.

## REFERENCES

1. Dayananda Ponnala Rajayogi, Nija Prabodha Vidhanamu, Rajayogashramam, 4th edition, 1993, P.133.
2. Dayananda Ponnala Rajayogi (Trans), Asparshayogamu Ane Srimadbhagavad Gita, Rajayogashramam, 1994, P. 39.
3. Dayananda Ponnala Rajayogi, Nija Prabodha Vidhanamu, Rajayogashramam, 4th edition, 1993, P .4-5.
4. Yilapakurthi Viravenkata Ramachandra Rao, Paripurna Darshanamu, 1st edition, 1965, P. 5.
5. Siva Rama Diksitolu, Brhadvasitamu, Vol. III, Rajayogashramam, 3rd Reprint, 1989, P. 1.
6. Yilapakurti Viravenkata Ramachandra Rao, Paripurna Darshanamu, 1st edition, 1965, P. 5.
7. Swami Gambhirananda (Trans), Eight Upanishads, Vol.II, Advaita Ashrama, Calcutta, 11th impression, 1998, P. 79.
8. Sri Vidyananda Prakashagiri, Upanisadratnakaramm, Sri Sukabrahmashramamu, 3rd print, 1994, P. 99.
9. Swami Gambhirananda (Trans), Eight Upanishads, Vol.II, Advaita Ashrama, Calcutta, 11th impression, 1998, P. 80.
10. Siva Rama Diksitolu, Brhadvasitamu, Vol. II, Rajayogashramam, 4th Reprint, 1990, P. 33.
11. Sri Vidyananda Prakashagiri, Upanisadratnakaramm, Sri Sukabrahmashramamu, 3rd print, 1994, P. 40.

12. ibid, P. 25.
13. Swami Gambhirananda (Trans), Bhagavad Gita, 2nd edition, Advaita Ashrama, Calcutta, 1991, P. 72.
14. Yilapakurti Viravenkata Ramachandra Rao, Paripurna Darshanamu, 1st edition, 1965, P. 293-294.
15. Sri Vidyananda Prakashagiri, Upanisadratnakaramm, Sri Sukabrahmashramamu, 3rd print, 1994, P. 4.
16. Yilapakurti Viravenkata Ramachandra Rao, Paripurna Darshanamu, 1st edition, 1965, P. 295.
17. ibid, P. 295.
18. Sri Vidyananda Prakashagiri, Upanisadratnakaramu, Sri Sukabrahmashramamu, 3rd print, 1994, P. 142.
19. ibid, P. 3.
20. ibid, P. 40.
21. ibid, P. 25.
22. ibid, P. 16.
23. Dayananda Ponnala Rajayogi (Trans), Asparsha yogamu Ane Srimadbhagavad Gita, Rajayogashramam, 1994, P. 139.
24. Swami Gambhirananda (Trans), Eight Upanishads, Vol.I, Advaita Ashrama, Calcutta, 3rd reprint, 1996, P. 147.
25. Sri Vidyananda Prakashagiri, Upanisadratnakaramm, Sri Sukabrahmashramamu, 3rd print, 1994, P. 248.

26. *ibid*, P. 147.
27. *ibid*, P. 48.
28. *ibid*, P. 235.
29. Dayananda Ponnala Rajayogi (Trans), Asparshayogam Ane Srimadbhagavad Gita, Rajayogashramam, 1994, P. 102.
30. Sri Vidyananda Prakashagiri, Upanisadratnakaramm, Sri Sukabrahmashramamu, 3rd print, 1994, P. 12.
31. Yilapakurti Viravenkata Ramachandra Rao, Paripurna Darshanamu, 1st edition, 1965, P. 270.
32. Bhagavata Krishna Desikulu, Suddha Nirguna Kandaritha Darvulu, 5th reprint, Rajayogashramamu, 1995, P. 131.
33. *ibid*, P. 113.
34. Sri Vidyananda Prakashagiri, Upanisadratnakaramm, Sri Sukabrahmashramamu, 3rd print, 1994, P. 1.
35. Swami Gambhirananda (Trans), Eight Upanishads, Vol.II, Advaita Ashrama, Calcutta, 11th impression, 1998, P. 135.
36. Sri Vidyananda Prakashagiri, Upanisadratnakaramm, Sri Sukabrahmashramamu, 3rd print, 1994, P. 44.
37. *ibid*, P. 63.
38. *ibid*, P. 76.
39. Dayananda Ponnala Rajayogi (Trans), Asparshayogam Ane Srimadbhagavad Gita, Rajayogashramam, 1994, P. 139.



40. Sri Vidyananda Prakashagiri, Upanisadratnakaramm, Sri Sukabrahmashramamu, 3rd print, 1994, P. 12.
41. ibid, P. 57.
42. ibid, P. 47.
43. Swami Gambhirananda (Trans), Eight Upanishads, Vol.I, Advaita Ashrama, Calcutta, 3rd reprint, 1996, P. 359.
44. Dayananda Ponnala Rajayogi (Trans), Asparshayogam Ane Srimadbhagavad Gita, Rajayogashramam, 1994, P. 102.
45. Sri Vidyananda Prakashagiri, Upanisadratnakaramm, Sri Sukabrahmashramamu, 3rd print, 1994, P. 37.
46. ibid, P. 147.
47. Swami Madhavananda (Trans), Vivekacudamani, Advaita Ashrama, Calcutta, 15th impression, 1998, P. 39.
48. Sri Vidyananda Prakashagiri, Upanisadratnakaramm, Sri Sukabrahmashramamu, 3rd print, 1994, P. 57.
49. Yilapakurti Viravenkata Ramachandra Rao, Paripurna Darshanamu, 1st edition, 1965, P. 313.
50. Bangore (editor), Vemana Padyalu, Tirumala Tirupathi Devasthanamulu, 1992, 3rd edition, P. 1.
51. Dayananda Ponnala Rajayogi (Trans), Asparshayogam Ane Srimadbhagavad Gita, Rajayogashramam, 1994, P. 68.
52. ibid, P. 185.

53. Yilapakurti Viravenkata Ramachandra Rao, Paripurna Darshanamu, 1st edition, 1965, P. 206.
54. ibid, P. 113.
55. ibid, P. 207.
56. ibid, P. 207.
57. ibid, P. 302.
58. Sri Vidyananda Prakashagiri, Upanisadratanakaramm, Sri Sukabrahmashramamu, 3rd print, 1994, P. 325.
59. Yilapakurti Viravenkata Ramachandra Rao, Paripurna Darshanamu, 1st edition, 1965, P. 303.
60. ibid, P. 305.

## **CHAPTER - V**

## **CONCLUSION**

## CHAPTER - V

### CONCLUSION

The Vedas, Upanisads, Brahma-Sutras, Bhagavad Gita etc., have been reviewed so far and it is inferred that the main cause of the world is Brahman. And it is also noticed that the argument, there is no creation, is not acceptable. When Brahman is in its own state without any *sankalpa*, there is no creation at all. But the *gunatrayas* are hidden in Brahman in subtle form which is known as *Prakrti* or *Avyakta* or *Pradhana* or *Mulamaya*. Because Brahman is consisting the *gunatrayas*, It is transforming into the world from its transcendental state. Someone says that *Saguna* Brahman is the cause of the world and someone else says that the *maya* in the form of *trigunas* is the cause of the world. However it is inevitable to conclude that the main cause of the world is Brahman (Yeruka).

In relation to the theory of Paripurna Rajayoga, in the following way, the cause of the creation is explained by using the *sruti*: '*tasmadva etasmatatmana akasassambhutih akasdvayuh vayoragnih agnerapah adbhyah prdhvi...*'<sup>1</sup> and '*akasassariram brahma*'. Hence it is adduced that Brahman is transformed into *Panca bhutas*. But Paripurna Brahman is completely different from Brahman (Yeruka) and there is no relation or no link between these two. And that Paripurna Brahman is indicated by the *sruti*: "*yato vaco nivartante aprapya manasa saha*"<sup>2</sup> i.e. Paripurna Brahman is beyond of speech and mind.

The outcomes of the main aims of Advaita, Visistadvaita, and Dvaita are hereby briefly reviewed in relation to their yoga systems:

The Advaita School advocates Jnana-Yoga to get liberation from *samsara*. But the Jnana -Yoga of the Advaita School is aimed at the unification of Jiva with Brahman so that its theory is not in reach of Paripurna Brahman which is the ultimate absolute reality of all scriptures. By reaching the state of Jnana -Yoga of the Advaita, one will be the Brahman (even if he does not know anything, he is not different from Brahman) so that he is again destined to take birth since Brahman is the cause of the world.

The Visistadvaita School supports Bhakti -Yoga and Prapatti-Yoga to get *moksa*. Brahman or Visnu of the Visistadvaita School is nothing but Yeruka. Until Yeruka is existing, it drives the cycle of the birth and death. Moreover the devotee has to wait for mercy of Visnu without which he could not get *moksa*. It indicates dependency of the system. And the ultimate absolute Paripurna Brahman is beyond of the destination of Visistadvaita.

The Madhva's Dvaita School is preaching its Bhakti-Yoga to get *moksa*. This theory is giving the most priority for the Divine grace. Without the Divine grace, none will get *moksa*. It is also indicating dependency on the Lord. In this theory, the Brahman is infinite, but Jiva is finite and these two are completely different from each other. This is highly impossible as a finite Jiva does not co-eternal with an infinite Brahman. Moreover Paripurna Brahman is beyond of the aim of the Dvaita School of Madhva.

Besides this, it is found that Karma and Jnana are inseparable and these two are interrelated with each other. And harmonious coordination between Jnana and Karma without fear is called Bhakti. In this co-ordination, one has to know the complete knowledge (Jnana) of the discrimination between Brahman and Paripurna Brahman. And then one has to perform the actions which are preceded by Jnana with '*trikarana suddhi*'. This method of practice is not only known as Bhakti-Yoga but also as Rajayoga (royal path) according to the theory of Paripurna Rajayoga. To free from the illusion of Brahman (Yeruka), one has to transcend even from this Bhakti-Yoga or Rajayoga also by practising '*karttrva rahita karmacarana*' (without assuming doer-ship). This was also explained by Vemana in his verse: "Mind, words, and works - if thou give up these three, and walk not up and down the royal path, then shall any loss befall the yogee"<sup>3</sup>. This is the next step which is required along with Rajayoga that leads to Paripurna Rajayoga.

Hence it is inferred that the destination of all other various philosophical systems is either *Saguna* Brahman or *Nirguna* Brahman. No one system is not aimed at Paripurna Brahman which is beyond of both *Saguna* and *Nirguna* Brahman. There is no doubt that rain from different clouds reaches the same sea. Similarly all other systems will reach the same destination, i.e. Brahman (Yeruka). Though all rain from different clouds reaches the same sea, but again due to the Sun that sea-water evaporates into the sky, and in rainy season, it is raining onto the earth. Hence all other concepts are indicating rebirth.

All religious masters indicated 'Brahman' as absolute, but it is transforming subtle to gross or gross to subtle. According to this doctrine, it is nothing but Yeruka. Hence the teachings or arguments of all others are not beyond of Yeruka and those are in and around Yeruka. Paripurna Brahman cannot be indicated in any manner by religious concepts. By viewing Yeruka in different angles, man has created various religions and concepts. Thus all these reach different states of Yeruka and there is no one destination for all religions.

But Paripurna Rajayoga is a complete yoga system which transcends from Brahman. In relation to Paripurna Rajayoga, all other yoga systems such as Karma-Yoga, Jnana-Yoga, and Bhakti-Yoga etc., of other philosophies lead to the various destinations in Brahman (Yeruka), but that yogas do not help to get either complete knowledge of Brahman (Yeruka) or Paripurna Brahman. Paripurna Rajayoga gives clear information about Brahman, Paripurna Brahman, and the difference between these Brahman.

The substance which is transforming from subtle to gross and gross to subtle is being called Brahman by others, where as it is being called Yeruka by this doctrine. There is no *sajatiya* difference because all is Yeruka. But Yeruka has *svagata* difference because it is getting multiplicity. And there is *vijatiya* difference because Paripurna Brahman is different from Yeruka. Hence *jagat* (world) cannot be *mithya*, but *Jagat* is as true as Brahman. Hence, it is not an Advaita concept. And it is not a Visistadvaita which has accepted *svagata* difference. However there is Paripurna Brahman different from Yeruka. So *vijatiya* difference is accepted in this doctrine. There

is nothing other than Paripurna Brahman hence it is not a Dvaita concept. Hence, this theory is distinctive from all other philosophies. But the facts of all other concepts are merging into the concept of Yeruka. How? *Jiva-Isvara-Jagat* is only one substance and is being called Yeruka. Hence it is Visistadvaita concept which has recognised the relationship between *dehi* and *deha* (soul and body). In the form of *Para* Yeruka (Brahman), it is appearing distinctively from Jiva and in the form of *Misrama* Yeruka (Jiva), it is in the bondage of *Samsara*. Hence, it is also a Dvaita concept<sup>4</sup>. But all these concepts are not beyond of Brahman (Yeruka). On the whole Yeruka imbibes all other concepts, religions, and philosophies. Hence it can be said that this theory is a complete and comprehensive concept or a *paripurna bhavamu* (complete idea).

But Paripurna Brahman is exceptional of all qualities and for that the way is also a distinctive one and so is its aim. Hence it is implied that the truth can be known only from the theory of Paripurna Rajayoga.



## REFERENCES

1. Sri Vidyananda Prakashagiri (Trans), Upanishadratanakaramu, 3rd edition, Sri Sukabrahmashramamu, Srikalahasti, 1994, P. 40.
2. ibid, P. 40.
3. C. P. Brown (Trans), Verses of Vemana, 4th reprint, Asian Educational Services, New Delhi, 1993, P. 73.
4. Yilapakurti Viravenkata Ramachandra Rao, Paripurna Darshnamu, 1st edition, 1965, P. 99.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. (Swami) Adidevananda (Trans), Sri Ramanuja Gita Bhasya, Sri Ramakrishna Math, Madras.
2. Animasen Guptha, A Critical Study of the Philosophy of Ramanuja, the chowkhamba Sanskrit Services Office, 1967.
3. Bangore (Editor), Vemana Padyalu, 3rd edition, Tirumala Tirupathi Devasthanamulu, Tirupathi, 1992.
4. Bhagavata Krishna Desikulu, Sakala Vedanta Sara Granthokta, Rajayogashramamu, 1990.
5. Bhagavata Krishna Desikulu, Suddha Nirguna Tatva Kandartha Darvulu, 5th edition, Rajayogashramamu, 1995.
6. Bhagavata Krishna Desikulu, Anustanavidhi, Rajayogashramamu, 1995.
7. Bhumananda Hanumantha Desikendrulu, Sri Bhumananda Vakya Trayamu, 8th reprint, Rajayogashramamu, Secunderabad, 1992.
8. Brown C. P. (Trans), Verses of Vemana, 4th reprint, Asian Educational Services, New Delhi, Madras, 1993.
9. Dayananda Ponnala Rajayogi, Sampradayaka Paripurna Probodhini, 2nd edition, Rajayogashramamu, Secunderabad, 1987.
10. Dayananda Ponnala Rajayogi, Nija Prabodha Vidhanamu, 4th reprint, Rajayogashramamu, 1993.

11. Dayananda Ponnala Rajayogi (Trans), Asparsha Yogamu Ane Srimadbhagavadgita, Rajayogashramamu, 1994.
12. Dayananda Ponnala Rajayogi, Paripurna Rajavidya Rajaguhya Shikhamani, 3rd reprint, Rajayogashramamu, 1996.
13. Dayananda Ponnala Rajayogi (Commentator), Suddha Nirguna Tatva Kandartha Darvulu and Ksaraksaropadhi Dvayadosha Rahita Parama Tatva Kandamulu, 5th reprint, Rajayogashramamu, 1995.
14. Dayananda Ponnala Rajayogi, Ananyachala Paripurna Prabodha, 2nd reprint, Rajayogashramamu, 1988.
15. Dayananda Ponnala Rajayogi, Parama Hamsa Prabodhini, 2nd reprint, Rajayogashramamu, 1987.
16. (Swami) Gambhirananda (Trans), Bhagavad Gita, 2nd edition, Advaita Ashrama, Calcutta, 1991.
17. (Swami) Gambhirananda (Trans), Eight Upanisads, Vol- I, 3rd reprint, Advaita Ashrama, Calcutta, 1996.
18. (Swami) Gambhirananda (Trans), Eight Upanisads, Vol- II, 2nd edition, Advaita Ashrama, Calcutta, 1998.
19. (Swami) Gnaneswarananda, Yoga for Beginners, 5th edition, Sri Ramakrishna Math.
20. Karel Werner, Yoga and Indian Philosophy, reprint, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1980.
21. (Swami) Madhavananda (Trans), Vivekacudamani, 15 impression, Advaita Ashrama, Calcutta, 1998.

22. Papaiah Rajayogi Parichuru, Yagnavalki Janaka Samvadamu, 3rd reprint, Rajayogashramamu, 1996.
23. Radhakrishnan S, Indian Philosophy, Vol- I, 9th impression, London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd, 1971.
24. Radhakrishnan S, Indian Philosophy, Vol- II, 8th impression, London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd, 1966.
25. Rajagopal Rao M and Subbamma P.C., Bharatiya Darshanamu, 1st edition, Telugu Akademi, 1971.
26. Shankar Rao Peelkhana (Trans), Sujnana Dipamu Anu Guru Gitalu, 12 th reprint, Rajayogashramamu, 1991.
27. Sharma B.N.K, Philosophy of Sri Madhvacarya, revised edition, Motilal Banarsidass, New Delhi, 1986.
28. Sharma B.N.K, Sri Madhva's Teachings in his own words, 2nd edition, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1970.
29. Siva Rama Diksitulu Ramadugu, Brhadvasistamu, Vol-I, Rajayogashramamu, Secunderabad, 1990.
30. Siva Rama Diksitulu Ramadugu, Brhadvasistamu, Vol-II, 4th impression, Rajayogashramamu, Secunderabad, 1990.
31. Siva Rama Diksitulu Ramadugu, Brhadvasistamu, Vol-III, 3rd impression, Rajayogashramamu, Secunderabad, 1989.
32. Subba Rau S (Trans), Bhagavad Gita, 1st edition, Publication India, New Delhi, 1988.
33. Surendranath Dasguptha, A History of Indian Philosophy, Vol-II, reprint, Cambridge, 1968.

34. Surendranath Dasguptha, A History of Indian Philosophy, Vol-III, reprint, Cambridge, 1968.
35. Surendranath Dasguptha, A History of Indian Philosophy, Vol-IV, Cambridge, 1973.
36. Vidyananda Prakashagiri (Trans), Upanishadratanakaramu, 3rd edition, Sri Sukabrahmashramamu, Srikalahasti, 1994.
37. Viravenkata Ramachandra Rao Yilapakurthi, Paripurna Darshanamu, 1st edition, 1965.
38. Viravenkata Ramachandra Rao Yilakurthi (Trans), Bhranthi Rahitha Slokamulu, 1st edition, Guntur, 1983.
39. (Swami) Vireswarananda and Swami Adidevananda (Trans), Brahma-Sutras Sribhasya, 3rd impression, Advaita Ashrama, Calcutta, 1995.
40. (Swami) Vireswarananda (Trans), Brahma-Sutras, 7th impression, Advaita Ashrama, Calcutta, 1996.

-----